

THE  
DUBLIN REVIEW.

59

---

VOL. VII. NEW SERIES.

---

JULY—OCTOBER,

MDCCCLXVI.

PUBLIC LIBRARY,

DETROIT. MICH.

SEP 17 1888

LONDON:

BURNS, LAMBERT, & OATES, 17 PORTMAN STREET

AND 63 PATERNOSTER ROW.

DERBY: RICHARDSON & SONS.

DUBLIN: JAMES DUFFY; W. B. KELLY.

1866.

WYMAN AND SONS, PRINTERS,  
GREAT QUEEN STREET, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS,  
LONDON.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS.\*

## ART. I.—JULIUS CÆSAR: BY NAPOLEON III.

Natural interest which we feel in a portrait of the first Cæsar by a modern Cæsar . . . . .	1
General character of the work as a history . . . . .	6
Rapid rise and fall of ancient States . . . . .	9
Count Franz de Champagny's history contrasted with the Emperor's . . . . .	11
Cæsar considered as popular Messiah . . . . .	13
The state of Roman society in his time . . . . .	14
Cæsar's policy . . . . .	19
The Emperor's studies of Cæsar's campaigns . . . . .	27
Pompey and Cæsar. . . . .	28
General conclusions . . . . .	32

## ART. II.—CANON OAKELEY'S LYRA LITURGICA.

A great characteristic of the Catholic Liturgy is its adaptation to sacred times and seasons . . . . .	33
Importance of accommodating private prayer to this plan . . . . .	35
Such is Canon Oakeley's purpose . . . . .	37
Specimens of its admirable execution . . . . .	39

## ART. III.—LECKY'S "HISTORY OF RATIONALISM."

A more philosophical method of historical study is a phenomenon of the time . . . . .	51
Mr. Lecky professes the application of this method to religion . . . . .	53
He even seems to think that no historical propositions whatever can be established on purely external evidence . . . . .	ib.
His opinion on the evidence for demoniacal possession . . . . .	55
His language concerning our Lady . . . . .	ib.
His great mistake in connecting the Catholic doctrine of hell-fire with a supposed belief in the soul's materiality . . . . .	58
There is far more unconscious anthropomorphism among the Protestant than among the Catholic poor. . . . .	63
Mr. Lecky's extreme misrepresentations of S. Thomas Aquinas . . . . .	66

\* Some of our readers have desired to see our Contents—especially those of articles on theological and philosophical subjects—set forth in somewhat fuller detail than is the usual custom; and we are glad to meet their view, in the hope that such a Syllabus as we have now given, may facilitate study and reference.

His great mistake in attributing whatever may be found cruel and repulsive in mediæval Catholics to their belief in the eternity of punishment . . .	70
The effect on mediæval Catholics of their belief in purgatory and in the sacraments . . . . .	73
The great effect produced on them by the intense and fervid teaching of mediæval Saints on the love of God . . . . .	76
The effect produced on them by devotion to the Blessed Sacrament and to the most Holy Virgin . . . . .	77
Concluding remarks . . . . .	78

---

#### ART. IV.—F. HYACINTH BESSON.

His Catholic education and early life . . . . .	80
He becomes a Dominican . . . . .	83
He is sent as missionary to the East . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Residence in Rome . . . . .	85
Returns to the East . . . . .	78
Heroic death . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>

---

#### ART. V.—IRISH WRITERS ON UNIVERSITY EDUCATION.

Mr. Whittle's comments on the DUBLIN REVIEW . . . . .	81
Dr. Sullivan in reply quotes the Bishop of Clifton . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Dr. Sullivan professes full intellectual submission to Papal Encyclicals, but seriously misinterprets two of them . . . . .	89
Mr. Whittle equally misinterprets them in an opposite direction . . . . .	90
The DUBLIN REVIEW has not spoken peremptorily except on matters whereon the Church has pronounced unmistakeably . . . . .	91
Mr. D'Arcy's discourteous and foolish language about the DUBLIN REVIEW . . . . .	93
The DUBLIN REVIEW is not an Irish publication . . . . .	94
Excellent passage, quoted by Dr. Sullivan, from the "Home and Foreign Review" . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
His own excellent remarks to the same effect . . . . .	95
Defence of the Irish Bishops and Clergy . . . . .	96
Admirable extract from Dr. M'Devitt . . . . .	97
As between Catholic and Catholic, two opinions are possible on the new scheme . . . . .	98
But it is shameless in Liberals to oppose it on liberal principles . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Illustration of this from a supposed dialogue between Lord Russell and a Liberal deputation . . . . .	99

---

#### ART. VI.—INTERESTS OF THE CATHOLIC POOR.

Social science . . . . .	101
Either a synonym for, or a human imitation of, the Church's system of charity . . . . .	104
The system overthrown at the Reformation . . . . .	104
The poor always better tended in proportion as the Church is more free . . . . .	106
Great active charity in England at the present time . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
But unfortunately perverted occasionally to proselyting purposes . . . . .	109

Three most striking Articles in "The Month," on Catholics in Workhouses and Prisons . . . . .	109
Recent appeals made by the Archbishop of Westminster . . . . .	110
Meeting at St. James's Hall . . . . .	114

## ART. VII.—THE NEGRO IN AFRICA AND THE WEST INDIES.

Mr. Baker's interesting volumes . . . . .	116
His strange and un-Christian theory that African savages are the remains of a race older than Adam . . . . .	120
Such a theory is directly opposed both to Christian truth and to the foundation of European civilization . . . . .	121
Mr. Baker's opinion as to the impossibility of raising the Negro character falls in with the English prejudice of this day . . . . .	122
This opinion is a re-action from excess on the opposite side . . . . .	123
It is totally false to allege as a fact that, industrially speaking, negro emancipation has been a failure in our West Indian Colonies . . . . .	124
It is false that the Jamaica negroes have been in the habit of demanding exorbitant wages . . . . .	130
The abolition of the <i>Slave-trade</i> was a great pecuniary loss to some of the colonies; but the abolition of slavery was beneficial to all . . . . .	132
Free trade, excellent as it is in itself, has been the real cause of their distress . . . . .	136
This period of distress has now passed away . . . . .	138
Mr. Baker's just detestation of the Nile slave-trade . . . . .	140

## ART. VIII.—DR. PUSEY ON MARIAN DEVOTION.

The present Article deals only with Dr. Pusey's objection that the Catholic worship of Mary tends to obscure the thought of God . . . . .	142
What are those Marian doctrines which the Church magisterially teaches? . . . . .	145
Positive evidence for the truth of these doctrines . . . . .	147
The notion is incidentally combatted that by the mere fact of believing that she can read the heart, Catholics account her divine . . . . .	148
Dr. Pusey's own objection precisely stated . . . . .	150
Statement of an objection entirely analogous, which might be made by an Unitarian or Deist against the worship of our Lord . . . . .	152
The answer which both Dr. Pusey and ourselves would give to this objection . . . . .	154
An answer precisely similar vindicates the worship of Mary . . . . .	157
Different classes of men to be considered . . . . .	ib.
The Marian devotion of that particular class which Dr. Pusey's argument concerns . . . . .	160
The case of interior and of saintly men . . . . .	172
Two final comments . . . . .	ib.
Further Marian doctrines very generally held among Catholics . . . . .	174
The thoughts and expressions of <i>individual writers</i> are divisible as regards authority into four classes . . . . .	177
Title of Co-redemptrix . . . . .	179
Other general propositions put forth by authorized writers . . . . .	180

Twenty-two propositions carefully considered, which have been cited by Dr. Pusey from Catholic writers, and have been accounted the most startling of all his extracts . . . . .	190
Conclusion . . . . .	199

---

#### ART. IX.—THE GAUME CONTROVERSY ON CLASSICAL STUDIES.

The Gaume controversy has of late been revived . . . . .	200
Anxiety of well-disposed foreigners on the future of society . . . . .	201
Under such anxiety Gaume wrote the "Ver Rongeur" . . . . .	205
Recent indications that a similar view is greatly extending . . . . .	208
How far is a similar view applicable to England? . . . . .	214
The principles on which Catholic education was conducted for fourteen hundred years . . . . .	217
General conclusions as to the limits and effects of the controversy . . . . .	225

---

#### X.—PAPAL BRIEF IN FAVOUR OF "LA CIVILTÀ CATTOLICA" . . . . . 229

---

#### XI.—NOTICES OF BOOKS . . . . . 234

Bishop Ullathorne on Anglican Unity—Bishop Dechamps' Second Eve—Mr. Sidden's "Cardinal Wiseman and Bishop Challoner"—*The Fortnightly Review*—*Etudes Religieuses*—Mr. Oxenham on the Eirenicon—F. Dalgairns' "Holy Communion"—A Catholic Eirenicon—Correspondence between F. Guy, O.S.B., and Canon McNeile—F. Rawes's "Homeward"—Dr. Shirley's Royal Letters of the Reign of Henry III.—Mrs. Pitt Byrne's *Cosas de España*—F. Sweeny's Lectures—Journal of Eugénie de Guérin—Mr. Schulthes' Religious Music—Lord Grey and Lord Dufferin on the State of Ireland.

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

---

### ART. I.—S. PIUS V., THE FATHER OF CHRISTENDOM.

S. Pius V. the last canonized Pope. His early history . . . . .	273
Appointed Inquisitor . . . . .	276
Visits Rome in that office . . . . .	278
Paul IV. creates him Cardinal . . . . .	281
Pius IV. succeeds Paul IV. . . . .	283
S. Pius V. elected Pope by the influence of S. Charles . . . . .	286
Condition of the Church at that period . . . . .	287
He institutes a general reform . . . . .	289
He turns his attention to the Turks . . . . .	294
He forms a league against the Huguenots . . . . .	295
He writes consolingly to Mary Stuart, and pronounces Elizabeth's deposition	296
Victory of Lepanto . . . . .	298
His death . . . . .	301

---

### ART. II.—PROTESTANT PROSELYTISM IN EASTERN LANDS.

Failure of Protestant missions and success of Catholic throughout the East	305
Turkish Mission Aid Society . . . . .	308
Loyal Catholicism of the Maronites . . . . .	313
Causes and results of "conversion" to Protestantism among the Easterns	315
Promotion by various English Consuls of a proselytising "Syrian Protestant College" . . . . .	323
Impossibility of excuse for such conduct on the part of Government officials.	325

---

### ART. III.—ORIGEN AT CÆSAREA.

Importance of Origen's position at Cæsarea . . . . .	332
His homilies there preached . . . . .	335
Disturbances caused by Maximin's persecution . . . . .	337

Origen's visit to Athens and praise of the Athenian Church . . . . .	339
His return to Cæsarea, and his "Contra Celsum" . . . . .	341
Celsus's intellectual position . . . . .	342
Origen's reluctant resolve to answer him . . . . .	344
Characteristics of Origen's reply . . . . .	345
Origen's orthodoxy and martyrdom . . . . .	360

---

#### ART. IV.—JAMAICA.

Report of the Commissioners . . . . .	362
Original language of the <i>Times</i> concerning the outbreak . . . . .	363
Comparison of this language with that of the Commissioners . . . . .	369
Origin of the discontent . . . . .	372
The case of Mr. Gordon . . . . .	380
Character and condition of the negroes . . . . .	385
Judgment of the Commissioners on the proclamation and duration of martial law . . . . .	390
Responsibility of Mr. Eyre and others . . . . .	391
English demonstrations in Mr. Eyre's favour . . . . .	401
The real meaning of martial law, in the only sense in which it is legal . . . . .	403
Extreme importance of obtaining some authoritative decision on the lawfulness of what has been done . . . . .	406
Public opinion in Jamaica . . . . .	407
The clamour against Mr. Eyre in England has in many instances been savage and violent; yet has done important service . . . . .	413

---

#### ART. V.—PIUS IX. AND THE "CIVILTÀ CATTOLICA."

Answer made in 1849 to Pius IX.'s appeal for literary defenders of Catholicism . . . . .	414
Pius IX.'s present requital of the "Civiltà" writers . . . . .	415
No literary defence of Catholicism will be praised by the Pope which is not purely Ultramontane in principle . . . . .	417
True authority of the Roman See . . . . .	418
The enmity of disloyal Catholics perhaps more dangerous than that of externs . . . . .	419

# CONTENTS.

iii

Pius IX.'s "crux de cruce" . . . . .	426
Singular qualifications for the Church's defence possessed by the Society of Jesus . . . . .	431

## ART. VI.—CROMWELL'S CONQUEST AND SETTLEMENT OF IRELAND.

Effects of the fall of Drogheda . . . . .	433
Venables' occupation of Ulster . . . . .	434
Ormond's appeal to the king . . . . .	437
Ormond's policy and conduct at this time . . . . .	439
Position of Owen Roe O'Neill . . . . .	440
Cromwell's position and policy . . . . .	441
He determines on the Munster war . . . . .	443
His march to Wexford . . . . .	444
The military situation . . . . .	447
The siege . . . . .	448
The sack and massacre . . . . .	449
Effects of the fall of Wexford . . . . .	454

## ART. VII.—DR. PUSEY ON MARIAN DOCTRINE.—PEACE THROUGH THE TRUTH.

Excellence and seasonableness of F. Harper's volume . . . . .	455
The Immaculate Conception . . . . .	457
Extraordinary significance of the prophecy in Gen. iii. 15 . . . . .	459
Mary's immunity from the "debitum proximum contrahendi originale peccatum" . . . . .	477
Her Assumption . . . . .	489
The error of supposing her co-present in the Eucharist. . . . .	491
Doctrines involved in the Church's devotion to her . . . . .	494
Defence of these doctrines as regards the language of Scripture . . . . .	498
Their defence as regards the silence of Scripture . . . . .	504
Their defence as regards the language and the silence of antiquity . . . . .	510
Conclusion. Peace through the Truth . . . . .	518

## VIII.—NOTICES OF BOOKS. . . . . 515

Analecta Juris Pontificii—Dr. Murray's Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi—F. Harper's Peace through the Truth. The Essay on Transubstantiation—F. Sweeney's Lectures on Catholic Faith and Practice—Mr. Lockhart's Possibilities and Difficulties of Reunion—Dr. Pusey's Speech at Church Union Meeting—The *Union Review*—The *Church Times*—Dr. McCorry's Mosaic Covenant and Christian Dispensation—F. Knox's Life of B. Henry Suso—Mr. Earle's Manual of the Popes—Dr. Maziere Brady's Alleged Conversion of the Irish Bishops to the Reformation.



THE  
DUBLIN REVIEW.

---

JULY, 1866.

---

ART. I.—JULIUS CÆSAR. BY NAPOLEON III.

*Histoire de Jules César.*—Tome I. et II.—Paris : Henri Plon.—1865, 1866.

FOR a modern Cæsar to write the history of that first Cæsar who bequeathed his very name to all future times as a symbol of power and greatness, is sufficient to attract our attention, and to deserve on the part of any competent critic at least his best endeavours to do justice to such an undertaking. But when the modern Cæsar has himself ascended the throne in consequence of a *coup d'état*; when his first step was to scatter before the winds a republican constitution,—to establish his own fabric on the ruins of that democracy, which had been reared and fostered for very different purposes;—when, again, he has succeeded in arrogating to himself a station of paramount importance in the political world, which looks up to him as a sort of umpire in every question tending more or less to jeopardize European tranquillity, our curiosity becomes highly excited, and we are far more disposed to search for the inmost workings of the imperial master-mind than for the scientific investigations and erudite discoveries of the historian. What are his views in regard to aristocracy and democracy? How are they to be moulded to his own will and pleasure? How far will he allow them to expand or oppose his power? How does he understand the combination of supreme prerogatives with that concession of constitutional freedom which seems to be the substratum and very essence of modern civilization? And then as to the grand figure he has undertaken to portray—how far will it be like the original, as handed down from olden times? Are we to have conjured up before us that strange mixture of sybarite effeminacy and heroic vigour, of the elegant patrician and the ranting demagogue—of a soaring genius and a squandering voluptuary, which are so singularly blended in the early years of Caius Julius Cæsar? Or are the old Roman heathenish features to be so remodelled,

so recast as to come forth before our wondering eyes in the form and attitude of a modern statue, every inch of which betrays a new race, however dexterously it may be robed in the senator's toga or the soldier's chlamys?

Such are some of the numerous questions which arose in every thinking mind when, a year ago, the first volume of *Julius Cæsar* was published by Napoleon III., and after the late issue of the second, those questions revive again. That they remain unanswered we by no means wish to insinuate; on the contrary, the imperial writer expresses his views with the greatest boldness. Whatever may be their intrinsic value,—however different from those of other historians, they are at any rate stated with a candour and a sober simplicity that challenge criticism and command on our part a fair and an impartial investigation. The French emperor, himself a *parvenu*, as he asserts, appeals to the literary world as a man of high scientific attainments: as such he has a right to be heard and judged *sine ira ac studio*. Bearing this constantly before our mind, we will endeavour, as far as lies in our power, to answer his claim.

The whole of the first volume may be considered as an introduction to the history of the great Roman, who appears to have exerted a sort of fascination over the imperial mind. At the outset, the system is exposed in strong and vivid colours. That system may be expressed in two words—*hero-worship*, by no means new to the readers of Mr. Carlyle. We may even venture to affirm that the crowned historian goes beyond the British writer in regard to this new species of idolatry, since he considers certain great men as so many Messiahs, whom it is a crime to oppose, an act of political suicide to withstand. The passage is so important, that we shall make no apology for placing it before the reader as it stands in the original French edition.

When certain extraordinary facts reveal an eminent genius, can anything be more contrary to good sense than to attribute them to the passions and feelings of mediocrity? Can anything be more erroneous than not to acknowledge the pre-eminence of those privileged beings, who, from time to time, rise on the scene of history like so many luminous beacons, breaking the darkness of their period and enlightening futurity? To deny this pre-eminence would be an insult on mankind, as it implies that mankind would submit of its own accord for a lengthened period to a rule grounded neither on true grandeur nor on incontestable utility. Let us be logical in order to be just.

Too many historians find it an easier task to lower men of genius than to rise, through a generous inspiration, to their height, and to fathom their grand

designs. Thus, in regard to Cæsar, instead of showing us Rome torn by civil wars, corrupted by wealth, trampling upon her old institutions, threatened by powerful nations, such as the Gauls, the Germans, and the Parthians, unable to endure without a strong and equitable government at the centre ; instead of tracing this faithful picture, we are told that, from an early age, Cæsar was already intent upon ascending to sovereign power. If he opposes Sylla, if he disagrees with Cicero, if he becomes intimate with Pompeius, it proceeds from that wary astuteness which foresees all in order to subdue all ; if he rushes into Gaul, it is to acquire wealth through plunder, or an army devoted to his plans ; if he crosses the sea to carry the Roman eagles into an unknown country—a conquest destined to confirm that of Gaul—it is merely to seek for pearls supposed to be found in the British seas. If, again, after conquering the most terrible enemies of Italy beyond the Alps, he meditates an expedition against the Parthians, with the view of avenging the defeat of Crassus, it is, maintain certain historians, because his constitution required activity, and a campaign strengthened his health. If he accepts with gratitude a crown of laurels conferred upon him by the Senate, it is to conceal his baldness ; and lastly, if he is murdered by those on whom he had lavished his favour, it was because he aspired to royalty ; as if, indeed, in the eyes of his contemporaries as well as of posterity, he were not greater than any king. Ever since Suetonius and Plutarch, such are the petty interpretations bestowed upon the most noble actions. But how are we to recognize the greatness of a man ? By the influence of his ideas, when his principles and system triumph over his very death or his defeat. Is it not indeed the marked feature of genius to live beyond annihilation itself, and to extend its empire over future generations ? Cæsar vanishes from our sight, and yet his influence rules stronger than in his lifetime. His antagonist, Cicero, must needs exclaim :—“ Every one of Cæsar’s actions, writings, words, promises, and views are even now more prevalent than when living.” For many a century it was sufficient to tell the world—such was the will of Cæsar—and the world obeyed.

The preceding lines are enough to show my object in writing the present history. That object is to prove that when Providence raises such men as Cæsar, Charlemagne, or Napoleon, it is to chalk out the road which nations are to follow—to imprint on a new era the stamp of their genius—to fulfil in a few short years the labour of several centuries. Happy those peoples who both understand and follow their leaders ! Woe to those who both misapprehend and oppose them ! They are like unto the Jews, who crucify their Messiah ; they are at once both blind and guilty—blind, for they do not see their own helplessness to prevent the ultimate triumph of what is right—guilty, for they only delay progress, by impeding its speedy and fruitful fulfilment.

In fact, neither Cæsar’s murder, nor the captivity of Saint Helena succeeded in destroying two popular causes, which were overthrown by a coalition that assumed the garb of freedom. Brutus, by killing Cæsar, plunged Rome into the horrors of a civil war ; he did not prevent the reign of Augustus, but he rendered possible the rule of a Nero and a Caligula. Likewise the ostracism of Napoleon by a combined Europe has not prevented the

resurrection of the empire ; and yet how far are we still from the solution of the most difficult problems, from the appeasement of certain passions, from the satisfaction of certain popular cravings, already secured under the first empire.

Such is the theory—Providential men or popular Messiahs are to be followed blindfold by a confiding generation, on pain of hurrying to wreck and ruin. The man of genius may prove himself an aspiring usurper, or pitiless conqueror, intent upon the realization of his own ambitious plans, deaf to every plea of humanity that may thwart his views of personal aggrandisement ; still all around, kings as well as nations, statesmen, magistrates, warriors, all must bend before *his* will, for within *his* breast lies imbedded the germ of a happy future, which it would be folly to crush, guilt to oppose. Doubtless his contemporaries, or immediate successors, entertained different ideas as to his secret motives, and, judging from his daily acts, they ascribed to him a somewhat mixed character, usual in mortal man—that strange compound of shining virtues and glaring vices ; but after all, their unvarying testimonies are marked down as tokens of mediocrity, if not even of jaundiced jealousy. Now it may be as well to ask ourselves whether this fine-spun system is not itself a deviation from those very laws of moral criticism which the author so justly points out as the groundwork of historical research ? Is it not going against every rule of evidence, and building up beforehand an edifice destined to deceive our eyes and beguile our conscience ? Is it not moulding a figure according to our own fancy, not according to the prescriptions of truth and science ? Granted that Cæsar rose far superior to all his contemporaries ; granted that he detected, with the keen glance of genius, the real weakness of his troubled times ; that he quickly perceived how inevitable was an impending monarchy, whatever might be its form or name, what then ? Why should he not bend the energies of his master-mind to the realization of his secret plans, and prepare the way for his future dictatorship ? Many were those beside him who ran the same race, and revelled in the same dream, though the golden circle was farther from their reach. What could prevent Cæsar from aspiring to the supreme rank ? Sylla and Marius and Pompeius had trampled upon the institutions of their fatherland and drenched its historic soil in blood ; Catiline had well-nigh succeeded in his desperate conspiracy ; wherefore should a man above them all have doubted or hesitated as to the final issue ? Nay, more, as we proceed through this first volume, we find that almost every other figure of mark is sacrificed to the ideal hero of the day,

to the successful statesman and warrior, who trod on the liberties of his country, and paved the way for that government which has become a byword for the most execrable tyranny that ever left its bloody imprint on the annals of mankind. Catulus, the honest *princeps* or leader of the Senate, is represented as a weak, besotted, benighted aristocrat, who takes his stand upon obsolete forms and antiquated notions; Cato, as a mere caricature of his celebrated ancestor; Cicero, as an eloquent special pleader, wavering in his views, hurried on by the stream, courting popularity, or cringing before the all-powerful triumvirs, simply to satisfy his own inordinate vanity, or allay his terrors! Is this fair? Or rather is it not coming round by a different road to the very result which the author deprecates, that of making both men and things agree with an *à priori* system—the system of hero-worship?

But there is another consequence of the theory we can by no means wink at or conceal. If every man of aspiring genius, like a Cæsar or a Napoleon, is to be considered as a Messiah, it is all over with freedom and free men. We have but to fall down and worship the idol, as a direct representative of Providence, or rather of fate, as his majesty is fond of expressing it. As for ourselves, we confess to having been brought up in a different school; we have been taught to kneel before God alone, and to revere a Vincent de Paul or a Thomas à Beckett far more than the most mighty genius, when that genius proves a despot, however enlightened in other respects he may be. Both in Cæsar and Napoleon, in Cromwell, Louis the Fourteenth, Frederick the Second, there are many dark spots, and if our eyes are wide open to their bright sides, why should we be blind to some of their actions, which no honest man, above all no Christian, can approve.

We have thought fit to enter our protest at the very outset against the system adopted by the author of *Julius Cæsar*, because it supplies a clue to the whole work, and is, in our opinion at least, derogatory to the dignity of man. We will even venture to affirm that the immediate consequences of that system did not occur to the writer's mind, or he would have modified his theory so as to make it coincide at least with the practice of his own reign. For, indeed, a most striking feature of the Imperial Government is its conformity to the popular will and tendencies of the nation. During the first years of its existence, the whole French people was unanimous in its advocacy of a strong arm to put an end to the periodical anarchy of the time being; and the foremost in their denunciations of popular institutions were the men who now stand up for freedom. Few were those who remained faithful to the

principles of their own lives ; and such was the general rush towards an absolute government, that perhaps we ought to compliment Napoleon III. for not reckoning upon the permanence of this transitory feeling. Of late years, however, the nation has awakened from its torpor ; a new generation has grown up, and, forgetful of former calamities, it now pants for free institutions ; thus reversing the picture which Tacitus drew of the Romans in the days of Augustus. At the same time, the French Government seems gradually relaxing its hold, and preparing the way for a return to those forms and rules which under every clime mark the advent of liberty. Would or could Cæsar have done this ? We say, No ; though upon the whole Cæsar was better than his times. But Christianity has not in vain ruled the world for eighteen long centuries, and the only true Messiah has so enfranchised man, that he can never more crouch as the Romans crouched, under the yoke of despotic power. Should Napoleon III. thoroughly understand this, he may leave one of the brightest pages in the annals of French history.

Having once fulfilled what we consider to be a conscientious duty, we may fairly recommend to the reader the present volumes. They open with a retrospective review of Roman history and of the institutions of the city from its birth. The author having naturally at his disposal, not only the resources of antiquity which are open to every scholar, but commanding likewise the numberless acquisitions of modern science, makes free use of both, and yet with a sobriety which does credit to his literary taste. The reader is interested and enlightened, not crushed or bewildered, by a display of erudition. He may wish for a style more brilliant, for a more animated picture of men and manners, such as Macaulay knew how to draw ; but still in this very sedateness there is something which impresses the facts strongly upon the mind, and brings home to our understanding that we have to do with a man who is himself at the helm, and knows what it is to breast the surging waves—a fact, by the bye, which establishes a sort of similarity between him and the historians of antiquity, many of whom had a share in the government of their respective countries. To this, perhaps, still more than to their native genius, may be attributed that absence of meretricious ornament—that simple, sterling, sober propriety of language, which are so peculiar to the productions of a Thucydides, a Cæsar, a Sallust, and a Tacitus.

Another remarkable feature of the present history is the full and clear comprehension of the value of aristocratical elements in the constitution of a country. One can easily see



that the author has been no inattentive observer of British society, as is testified by the following comparison between the Roman and English patricians :—

At the beginning of the fifth century from the foundation of Rome (418), the Senate remained omnipotent, in spite of the plebeian victories; for independently of such means as it had at its disposal, it was at liberty to elude the plebiscita which it had to apply. If the influence of a preponderating class tempered the practice of political liberty, still the laws fettered in a far higher degree the enjoyment of individual freedom. Thus, not only was every member of a family subjected to the unlimited authority of its head, but every citizen was bound to obey numberless obligations of a stringent character. The censor kept a vigilant watch over the purity of the marriage tie, over the education of children, the treatment of slaves and clients, the cultivation of lands. "In the opinion of the Romans," says Plutarch, "no individual was at liberty to marry, to bring up children, to select his own mode of living, to give banquets—in fact, to follow his own wishes and tastes, without previously undergoing an inspection and an ordeal."

The State was at this period very like England's before the Parliamentary reform. For several ages the British Constitution had been extolled as a palladium of freedom, though even then, as at Rome, birth and fortune were the only sources of honour and power. In both countries the aristocracy, lording over the elections through intrigues, through bribery or rotten boroughs, was enabled to return patricians in Rome or noblemen in England, and a man without the elective franchise was no citizen in either. However, if, before 1789, the English people had no share in the management of public affairs, they were right to boast of a liberty which shone forth so splendidly amidst the dark and silent atmosphere of the continent. A disinterested observer does not examine whether the stage on which the gravest political questions are discussed is of vast extent, or whether the actors are more or less numerous : he is, above all, struck with the grandeur of the scene. So we are far from blaming the nobility, either in Rome or England, for having maintained their supremacy by every means which the law or custom placed at their disposal. The patricians were bound evidently to preserve their power as long as they were worthy of it ; and we are ready to acknowledge that, without their perseverance in the same system of policy, without those lofty views, that rigid and inflexible virtue, which are so many characteristic features of an aristocracy, the edifice of Roman civilization would have never been reared.

At the time when Rome entered upon the conquest of Italy, previous to that of the world, our author endeavours to show the different combinations of circumstances which facilitated this great undertaking and insured its success. Those prominent traits of the Roman policy in regard to the conquered nations have been so often brought out in their true colours by Montesquieu, Mommsen, Drumann, Merivale, and other

eminent writers, that we shall refrain from enlarging on the subject. But still it may be well to remember that the posterity of Romulus were the first to set such an example, utterly ignored by the Greeks, though their distant colonies on the Mediterranean shores never voluntarily cut the link which bound them to the mother country. This greatly accounts for the extraordinary success of the Romans, even setting aside the innate superiority of their own internal organization. As the Imperial author very properly observes, the Senate, by bestowing upon the citizen certain rights and privileges, which every one found it beneficial to possess, gave a strong impulse to lawful ambition; and one of the most remarkable outlines of ancient society is precisely this general tendency, not to overthrow, but to enjoy the privilege. Both in the city and in the State, malcontents and even insurgents did not, as in modern times, aim at pulling to pieces, but they themselves endeavoured to enter within the precincts of the legal sanctuary. So that every man, according to his rank and status, had a lawful goal before his eyes: the plebeian was ambitious of rising to the level of the aristocracy; the Italiots sought to share in the Roman sovereignty, not to impugn it; the Roman provinces, to be declared the allies and friends of Rome, not to recover their independence.

We may consider this period as the golden era of the Republic, but too soon superseded by those scenes of misrule, violence, and civil bloodshed which ushered in the Syllan and Marian proscriptions, and then the Triumvirate, and then with Cæsar himself the downfall of the commonwealth. Just as he is about to describe these troubled times, the Emperor pauses as if to take a farewell view of the preceding age in a chapter on the fair regions which enclose the Mediterranean—a chapter wherein every scholar, as well as the mere historical tyro, may glean valuable information. The picture of ancient trade and commerce is complete, thus supplying a deficiency of the most popular works in modern times. It forms altogether an admirable essay on political and commercial geography in those distant times, and would be sufficient to distinguish any writer.

The reader who, not contenting himself with a superficial observation of men and events in the study of ancient history, endeavours to gauge the deeper causes of the rise and fall of heathen nations, is struck by an ever-recurring phenomenon. The rise is usually sudden, the fall no less rapid, just as certain lovely flowers bloom in the morning, and fade ere the sun sets over their fleeting efflorescence. The Greece of our fond recollections lasts but the age of Pericles—nay, less,



hardly fifty years of that noble century; and then comes Alexander with his conquering legions, and then a final collapse. When Rome had subdued Italy, and bestowed her citizenship upon the Italian race,—when she had made Carthage one huge heap of wreck and ruin, what became of her boasted austerity of manners, of her social virtues, her high feeling of honour and equity, her chivalrous adherence to principle in preference to utility, to oppression, to violence, to craft of every description? We have scarcely turned the page, when we are hurried headlong into scenes of moral depravation within the family circle, of scurrilous infidelity scoffing at the Gods, of barefaced iniquity in the Senate, of bloodshed, riots, bribery, both in the Forum and in the courts of justice; whilst the provinces are subjected to an immense system of depredation, plunder, and oppression, in order to gorge and enrich a few hundred patricians or middlemen. How is this? And, above all, how is it that there exists, in this respect, such a marked contrast between ancient and modern civilization? On the one side, a corroding principle seems to prey upon the very vitals of heathen society, and to snap asunder the thread of its existence; on the other, after periods of corruption, and violence, and social convulsions, equal, perhaps, to those of old, we never fail to witness the development of a healing power, cancelling past evils, infusing new moral strength into the individual, and thus gradually invigorating once more the body politic, leavening the whole mass to such a degree that a period of degeneracy and languor is frequently succeeded by a far higher flight towards the zenith of power and excellence. Again we put the question, How are we to account for this? to what historian are we to turn for an explanation of the problem?

Unfortunately the answer is most simple—to none. Begin with Montesquieu and Gibbon, continue with the host of German writers who have spun out in every form the history of old Rome, and conclude with a *Merimée*, a *Michelet*, an *Amédée Thierry*, or even the imperial publication we are now reviewing, you will find no reply to this all important question—the very nucleus of a philosophy of history. So we must try to answer for ourselves.

The most superficial acquaintance with the nature and essence of the soul is sufficient to show us that any obscurity, any ignorance as to the link which connects the rational with the supernatural, will soon vitiate the whole mind of man. In other words, suppose any nation, however sound and perfect its organization, to be ignorant of the nature of God, and you are sure to meet with cracks and flaws no less in the founda-

tions than in the superstructure of the body politic. Man's duties towards his Maker being unknown, or partially concealed by polytheism, his notions grow equally loose as to his duties towards his neighbour. The very idea of vice and virtue becomes gradually obliterated, so that in the long run vice itself is placed upon the altar and worshipped with far greater devotion than moral dignity, deprived as the latter is of its sole source of strength. Hence the astonishing facility with which the most polished nations of antiquity rush into a vortex of moral and political corruption, of which we can hardly at present form a conception. Those alone who are well versed in the study of the Roman poets and annals know the truth of our affirmation, and how far the Christian revelation has lifted mankind out of this turbid stream. But let us realize, at any rate, the baneful effects on society of the following vices, which were prevalent among the Romans towards the latter end of the Republic, or about one century before Christ:—Adultery and fornication in its worst forms; might substituted for right, and applying wholesale to slavery. The slave was a thing, a chattel, or a nonentity, according to his master's will or caprice. He might be chained to a post, as the porters at the entrance of a villa, or sleep at night underground, and bound in the ergastulum, or be tortured by some young girl in her teens, merely because the poor unfortunate had broken a favourite vase, or forgotten to feed a petted mullet of the fish-pond. Now imagine these acts of immorality, tyranny, injustice, cruelty, bribery, debauchery, and sensuality, repeated day after day, night after night, in every street of Rome, in every Italian city or colony, in every province, in every region, for months and years, and what a long vista of degradation and decline at once opens upon us! How the stagnant cesspool is constantly sending up its pestilential exhalations! How deeply it oozes forth in every direction, until it permeates the whole soil! We turn aghast when, in the nineteenth century of the Christian era, some great crime such as that of a Winsor, or a Pritchard, or a La Pommerais, is revealed in its naked horrors, as if to show how deep-rooted is the evil principle in the human soul; but what if we had a wholesale system of abortion or exposure of newborn babes? What if we considered it as a right in a father to abandon his own children? What if we had temples for a cult of open immorality, under the advocacy of some foul oriental demon? Could any providential hero, any pseudo-Messiah, save us from utter destruction? Where is the Cæsar, himself a prey, let it be remembered, to many a headstrong passion, who could stop us in our course down

the inclined plane? True, his genius might prop up and abut for awhile the tottering edifice, but the strong shoulders of the giant once removed, who is to continue his work? Cæsar murdered, did Roman society obtain a reprieve worth mentioning? We know that Octavius emerged into Augustus, but after Augustus, what a constant downfall from bad to worse, even under the best emperors!

Such are the considerations and views it would be useless to look for in all modern histories of Rome, with one exception, however, supplied by Count Franz de Champagny, in his excellent work on the Cæsars and the Antonines, which we reviewed in April. We confess to having expected something of the same Christian philosophy in the publication now before us. It would seem that a Sovereign possessed of so much insight into the secret workings of worldly policy; so well taught in the school of adversity; so suddenly raised to one of the most exalted stations, should have perceived at a glance the real cause of that weakness which is apparent in ancient society. But we say it with feelings of disappointment, from one end to the other of these volumes we meet with the same bold policy of expediency; the same utilitarian views; the same prevalence of principles which might grace an elaborate essay written by some old heathen philosopher, but appear quite out of place in our times. We are ever referred to fate and destiny as ruling over human affairs, instead of Divine Providence. On other occasions we are startled by some extraordinary assertion brought out with a coolness that baffles explanation. Here is a striking instance of our meaning. In his youth, Cæsar being obliged to conceal himself in the neighbourhood of Rome to escape from the persecuting bands of Sylla, changed his abode every night, though labouring under fever. He was, however, caught by the dictator's bands of assassins, but having bribed their commander, Cornelius Phazita, by a timely present of two talents (about £500), his life was spared. "Let us observe," adds his imperial historian, "that when Cæsar himself succeeded to the supreme power, he met once more this Phazita, but treated him with kindness, and *forgot the past.*" The author cannot mean assuredly that Cæsar would have been justified in avenging himself on a man who had saved his life, even at the expense of a bribe, and yet what other construction can we put on the sentence?

It is certainly in no carping spirit that we make these observations, which we would have far preferred to have omitted—let us at least hope that as the work progresses, the new historian of Julius Cæsar will develop views more reconcilable to what we might term the general conscience of

mankind. Above all we sincerely regret that from the very first a system should have been adopted which tends to justify every aspiring genius in overthrowing the constitution of his country, instead of reforming it; of establishing by dint of sheer force his own absolute authority, instead of banding together every talent, every energy, to stem the torrent, and rise superior to the evil influences which are at work in society. When a man is pointed out as a Messiah, of course the whole mass of historical evidence is warped and made to bear in his favour; whilst on the contrary, every incident which may tell against him is attenuated or considered as a downright calumny. In the work before us there are numerous instances of this kind, and yet why should Cæsar be held up as an unblemished character, when every vice and every act of unscrupulous ambition on his part is exactly in accordance with the vices and even the crimes of his age? In heathen virtue there is always something hollow and infirm in purpose, as is fully shown by the moral character of a Cato, a Cicero, or a Marcus Aurelius. But why should the great Roman orator be constantly held out as a sort of puppet in the hands of a proud oligarchy; as a changeling, ever serving the time and purpose of the day? As you read on you are singularly surprised with the fact that what we should call parliamentary eloquence and statesmanship are objects of bitter hatred to the writer, who endeavours to personify in Cicero certain eminent personages of his own country. We freely confess our dislike to such a system, so totally averse to our notions of real impartiality.

And yet what an instructive period for a Frenchman, more especially for a French emperor, to study. There he may find the same passions; the same political parties; the same extreme opinions; the same quarrels; the same friendships; the same animosity. Such is the external sameness of man. On opening history at any page, our first impression is to mark numberless differences between one period and another; our second, to acknowledge that every period is very much like its forerunner. Tear away the cloak, the toga, or the coat, and you have no more a Greek, a Roman, or a Frenchman; you have before your eyes Man, with his passions, his intellect, his whole being. He who does not fully understand this needs hardly to study history.

The seventy years which preceded Cæsar's age and life are some of the most interesting in the annals of mankind, without even excepting our own, for scarcely any have supplied so much valuable information. Cæsar himself wrote his campaigns, which are a model of precision and sound good sense,

wherein the ability of the statesman shines through the simplicity of the soldier. Sallust, a man bound to Cæsar by every tie, is an author somewhat like our modern public writers, with their proneness to sophistry and to pedantry. He retires from our view in order to place his own reputation in a favourable light,\* and to preach a sort of morality to his old party; and by so doing he indites one of the most curious narratives in antiquity. Then come two Greeks, Plutarch and Dion Cassius, both liable to suspicion, the one for his admiration, the other for his disparagement, of the Roman republic. And yet both are well worth reading, the enthusiast more especially; for there is always more good faith, more sterling truthfulness, in the enthusiast than in the satirist. But the great historian of these exciting times is Cicero. Setting aside his famous harangues, what other epoch would supply us with a whole collection of letters written to a brother, to a wife, to a bosom friend, about the daily events, by the most sensible, most impartial, and most keen-sighted observer; the more keen-sighted, indeed, that he is more wavering in politics. One would really have imagined that an authority of such high standing would have found more favour in the eyes of a modern Cæsar.

But in regard to the Cæsar of heathen Rome, does he in fact deserve that ambitious title of a popular *Messiah*, which his new biographer bestows upon him? Did he positively alter the state of the world over which he ruled supreme? Did he reform the vices, purify the morals, enlarge the liberties, increase the welfare, of the people? Perhaps the best way of replying to this question will be to cast a hasty glance at the condition of society at the period when Cæsar seized the reins of power, and then to leave to the imperial writer the task of proving his theory in his subsequent volumes.

The period included between the Syllan proscriptions and the battle of Actium may be counted among the most active in the history of the world. Revolution becomes permanent. When war is not raging on the field of battle, it glares forth in the forum; when the legions do not bribe their commanders to lead them on to plunder Rome, driving before them the forlorn Italians like so many sheep to the shambles, we

---

\* Observe the following passages :—"Sed ego adolescentulus initio, sicuti plerique, a studio ad rempublicam latus sum; ibique mihi multa adversa fuere" (Catil. III.) And farther on he adds, "I have devoted but little of my time to war, to hunting, to horsemanship; but I have strengthened my mind, having both read and listened abundantly, with a view of apprehending through what means nations rise to their highest eminence, &c."

have before us thousands of freemen and freedmen, and bondsmen and gladiators, deliberating at the foot of the Capitol, sword or cudgel in hand. Such is their state of peace! The whole of Italy, or 900,000 men, have a right to the electoral franchise. What a surging sea must this assuredly have presented!

In every corner, in every by-place, men are in a fever; be it from offended pride or the resentment of their sufferings, they seem intent upon sharing in the great dismemberment of the Roman power. Wandering shepherds, vagrant descendants of the old Samnites, hosts of fugitive slaves, at once the oppressors and booty of a barbarian world, all are ready to answer the call of any Catiline. The Scythians, though so far off from Rome, rise against it at the beck of Mithridates. Asia, though its best blood had been sucked by Roman covetousness, jumps into thousands of crazy skiffs, and the whole sea is infested with pirates. Again, the Marian party, expelled from Italy, having found a refuge in Spain, aims, under Sertorius, at building a new Rome over and against the old Rome of the patricians. Gaul, subdued and already half-Romanized, revolts against the conqueror, and more than sixty insurgent nations foam and seethe around Cæsar. 1,200,000 men perished in the Gallic wars! On the other hand, the Sicilian shepherds, a pack of slaves whom their masters did not even pretend to feed, seize upon their unwieldy staves, and, with simple goatskins on their backs, set up for brigands. To reduce them, campaign upon campaign becomes necessary, and another million of human lives is sacrificed. Lastly, the gladiators, tired of killing and being killed for the pleasure of a Roman audience, take into their heads to slay and die on their own account. Spartacus plants his tent at the very gates of Rome, which but a few years before was almost taken by a horde of Samnite herdsmen.

And yet, in the midst of all these bloody divisions, the empire stands erect. Cæsar subdues Gaul; Mithridates gives up Asia; Sertorius, whilst upheaving Spain against Rome, really secures it to Rome; every dying party drags along with it in its fall some tottering royalty or some independent nation;—an expiring republic expands as if to bequeath its newly-acquired possessions to the future monarchy. Nay, more: civilization itself is hardly endangered; this writhing world is full of enlightenment. They are by no means barbarians, those men who massacre their fellow-citizens in the Forum. No; they are endowed with every accomplishment: their manners are polished and gentlemanlike; their minds are highly cultivated; they have studied at Athens, speak Greek as well



as Isocrates himself; fight for Zeno quite as readily as for the Republic; plunder a province merely to enrich their own galleries; and slay men by thousands, in order to obtain possession of a Praxiteles. Cæsar is an orator, a grammarian, and a poet; Verres, a sort of Winckelmann. During one year of retirement from public affairs, Cicero translates the whole *cyclus* of Greek philosophy; and Epicureism becomes naturalized in Rome only under the poetical garb with which Lucretius has enrobed it.

Such is the bright side of Roman civilization; but beneath it all was rotten—rotten to the core; the social system itself was rotten. The great cause of this rottenness was luxury; and that luxury was very different from what we moderns understand by the term. We are disposed to consider as a trite saw of the old philosophers the famous lines—

“ . . . . . Lævior armis  
Luxuria incubuit victumque ulciscitur orbem.”

And yet the ancients had very good reasons for holding such language. Luxury among them was by no means, as with us, an exchange of labour and wealth between the opulent and the working classes,—an exchange carrying along with it a certain compensation for its evils. Throughout all antiquity the working-man was enslaved: he received no salary but as a favour, could stipulate no prices, nor proportion his production according to the laws of consumption. Enjoying no freedom, he was not stimulated by competition, nor by the hope of bettering his condition. What we call industry amounted to nothing else but a duty fulfilled by the slave towards a taskmaster; what we call commerce was, among the Romans, only an all-devouring system of usury. Free labour and free industry are boons conferred upon mankind by Christianity; there is scarcely any trace of either beyond the eleventh century and the Crusades.

Such being the state of things, the whole world fell back upon agriculture as its last resource. But at that time what was the condition of agriculture itself? It is all very well for Virgil to exclaim—

“ O fortunatos nimium, sua si bona nôrint  
Agricolæ.”

In reality, there was no happiness for them, or rather they were bound down by such a yoke of tyranny as we can hardly conceive. And yet if we do not, it will be difficult to understand either Cæsar or his age. We have no wish to explain

the nature of the *ager romanus* and the *ager publicus*; the task has been so often and so well done, that it would be presumptuous on our part to go over the same ground; but it is necessary for our purpose to show that the greater part of the soil was in the hands of the *nobilitas*, or new-fashioned nobility, and of the knights, or *novi homines*, as they are so frequently called by Cicero.

The possession of certain magistracies entitled a man to a seat in the Senate; the right of bearing the likenesses and images of one's family on public occasions (*jus imaginum*) made a nobleman; your fortune alone made you a knight. The farming out of the taxes, and other obscure but lucrative stations, were ever filling the knight's purse. These publicans, as they were called, formed a most extensive system of commercial companies, spreading throughout the whole empire, and corresponding through a special system of postage from East to West, from Asia to Spain. Their central point is naturally at Rome, where they have a supreme direction (*magister societatum*); their influence almost overrules that of the Senate; they are all-powerful in the Forum, where blood was so often shed to support their interests. The knights are now a third power in the State, mediating between the Senate and the people, pretending even to separate seats in the Amphitheatre—a privilege which the Senators themselves did not always enjoy.

And then they held in their hands usury—that great resource of the old aristocracy. Little by little, either through long possession, or leases, or as money-lenders on mortgages, a vast amount of private and public lands became their property, thus originating the system of *latifundia*, which contributed so largely to impoverish both Italy and the world. Nor was it merely from rapacity that these middlemen were ever increasing their landed property (*continuaræ agros*); they likewise yielded to a feeling of dignity. A civilized Roman, in other words, a Roman gentleman, required plenty of room around him for all his splendour—room for his villas, for his gardens, planted with exotic trees; room for his aviaries, his large fishponds, his crowd of friends, clients, freedmen, and slaves. How could a park of a few acres content a tax-gatherer who had dwelt in the kingly palaces of Asia? So he was obliged to add acre to acre, to acquire by right or by might the neighbouring inheritance, to expel the poor man who was in debt and could find no bail; to usurp the patch of land of a soldier who, on parting from his home to join a legion, left behind him a family yet too young to till the ground; to do a job now and then with some legionary, who returned centurion



after twenty years' service, but exhausted by continual hardships, and quite unable to go through the duties of husbandry. The *latifundium* was of a most encroaching nature, absorbing gradually every small estate, and growing from a moderate-sized property into a large province.

But will these lands so easily acquired be at least cultivated with care? No; for the very title-deed of the new possessor is of a doubtful, precarious, temporary character; there is more of the creditor than of the owner in his nature; he may be a keeper, he is by no means a gentleman farmer. Besides, to farm one's own grounds is now beneath a Roman's dignity; to let them out is a source of petty squabbles; a farmer discusses and maintains his own interests, and often turns out to be a bad payer; and then at the very time of sowing or reaping, a war may carry him off to the army. Far better is the slave, an animal, a beast of burden, who can labour as long as you please under the lash of another slave like himself; who, in his old age, may still be sold for a few dollars, and who, best of all, will never be deemed worthy of fighting under the Roman eagles. Yea, the slave—such is the proper tool, and a cheap one, to boot; for as yet no one fears a dearth of slaves. Have not we got in the market numberless Thracians, Africans, Spaniards, all manacled, all bearing on their backs the brand-mark of servitude? And throughout Greece and Asia, are there not thousands of dealers in human flesh, ever on the look-out even for freemen, of whom they bring over whole cargoes to Rome? So the *latifundium* will be given over to slavish hands; the *tugurium* of the poor Roman husbandman will be pulled down, as in our days the cottage of the evicted Irish peasant; whilst the wide-expanding villa ever goes on encroaching, with its gangs of labourers, who sleep at night bound to each other in the *ergastulum*.

True, the slave hardly can be said to cultivate the soil, or he does it with a broken spirit, with no heart in his business; but who cares for that? After all he makes a tolerable shepherd; so that sheepwalks and pasture-land may easily supersede corn-fields and vineyards. The system answered well, and made more than one rich capitalist. Thus, by degrees, small estates were merged into large principalities, luxury replaced useful labour, the slave expelled the husbandman; the shepherd, the substantial yeoman. After all, this rapid increase of fortune it merely pampered the inertness and sensual indolence of the wealthy. Moreover, the Italian soil was considered as a pleasure land: a gentleman must have one villa at Tivoli to be near to Rome; another near Naples, for the sake of the

sea-breeze ; a third in the Apennine ravines, for the sake of solitude, with roads built exclusively for the use of the happy possessors, with hostelries erected for himself and his friends. Such are the requirements of Roman pride and luxury. Of course a plentiful income must be found somewhere to support all this magnificence ; and so we have made sure of fertile lands in Sicily, capital investments of money in the provinces, shops and large warehouses let out in the best parts of Rome, in fact, our fortune lies everywhere else but at home. Never mind, we are Roman citizens ; as such our property must be established on the best principles of Roman law, and on the privileged soil of Italy.

But what will become of the free population thus displaced ; of that *plebs rustica*, the very pith and marrow of the commonwealth ; the fruitful nursery of so many armies, deemed so highly superior to the *plebs urbana* in former times ? They are no less proud and privileged, as being of Roman birth ; they deem themselves equal to the patrician order ; but then, as they are generally poor, they become an object of contempt, fit for eviction and for being a prey to merciless usury. Private industry is all in the hands of the slaves, and accrues to the benefit of the wealthy ; so it proves totally unproductive in their hands. The protective laws, such as the *L. Porcia L. Sempronia*, which we might call the bill of rights of a Roman citizen, are not even always respected in favour of the plebeian tenant who dwells in the country, and he is sometimes whipped like the bondsman, or sent out into some distant province, there to work and drudge like a common slave.

Whenever, in the study of a historical character, we wish to scan the depth of his genius and measure the degree of influence he has really exerted either over his contemporaries or posterity, it is of high importance to ascertain what is the condition of the society over which he swayed, and which he stamped, as it were, with the imprint of his own spirit. How are we to fathom the workings of his great mind, if we have not before our eye the obstacles he had to overcome ? And what obstacles can be greater than those arising out of the moral degradation of a nation, or out of the constant violation of such economical laws of production and consumption as are indispensable to the well-being of any civilized country ? That is the very reason why we have dwelt at some length on the social rather than on the political condition of the Roman republic when Cæsar assumed the supreme power. It will now be an easy task to draw up the balance and account, so to speak, of what he really did to strengthen that huge fabric which he bequeathed to his successors. But how such

an important side of the question should have escaped the author of the work we have now before us, is in our eyes utterly incomprehensible.

As soon as Cæsar became an influential leader of the popular party, we ever see him tending to undermine the authority of the Senate, and to please the people by dividing the public lands among the poorer classes. On one occasion, he settled no less than 150,000 inhabitants of Rome in distant colonies, in order to rid the city of the most unruly portion of its population. This measure was certainly a wise one; and yet it hardly satisfied even those who benefitted by its enactments. They preferred by far a life of laziness in Rome to the most honourable activity of an agricultural life. At any rate, we can see no reason why Cæsar should have so steadfastly opposed the old senatorial traditions, unless it were to satisfy his own ambitious purposes. This our author will hardly admit, and yet almost every page of these troubled times tends to confirm our views of the case. Had he been something more of the *Messiah*, and something less of the man, his great aim would have been to reform the morals of his countrymen, and to alter the condition of labour in the heathen world. But this was more than any genius, however transcendent—than any statesman, however powerful and able, could accomplish or dream of. So it was no fault of Cæsar's if the very idea of such a revolution did not even cross his mind. We know in what quarter that revolution was to arise—he could not. So under Cæsar, as well as after Cæsar, this huge mass of Roman corruption, iniquity, cruelty went on, preying upon the very vitals of society, destroying one by one every principle of standing order, until the notions of order, justice, industry, labour, and so forth appeared in the eyes of men something antiquated,—something fit for old-fashioned enthusiasts, or, at the best, for the pompous declamation of a sophist. Such is the light by which we ought to view Cæsar's genius and Cæsar's times; it is far safer, we venture to affirm, than the boldest theories about Providential men, and national Messiahs, as the second volume now before us places beyond dispute.

That volume opens with observations—which we find repeated farther on in a more developed form, and as both these passages may be said to contain the spirit and leading idea of the whole work, it may be as well to lay them before the reader. On beginning the narrative of Cæsar's expeditions in Gaul, his imperial biographer expresses himself in the following terms:—

When Suetonius attributes the idea of these expeditions carried on by the great man to the sole wish of enriching himself by booty, it is an insult on history and common sense, and he converts a most noble design into a most vulgar object. When other historians impute to Cæsar the sole intention of seeking in Gaul the means of conquering the supreme power, they display a false perspicacity; judging of events by their final result, instead of coolly weighing the causes that produced them. No, it was not sovereignty which Cæsar sought for in the Gauls; it was by far rather that pure and exalted glory, arising out of a national war, carried on in obedience to the traditional interests of one's country (pp. 9-11).

Again (p. 349) :—

Certain writers who feel absolute irritation at the sight of glory do all in their power to lower it. *They* seem to believe that they thus will weaken the judgment of former times; *we* prefer to strengthen it by showing why the reputation of certain men has filled the world. To place in a strong light heroic examples,—to prove that glory is the lawful reward of great actions, is merely bowing respectfully to the public opinion of all ages. A man who has to contend with almost insuperable difficulties, and yet who overcomes them by his own genius, that man offers a spectacle ever worthy of our admiration; and that admiration is all the better grounded, in proportion as there yawns between the object and the means a wider abyss.

Now, if we take every word of the above lines—and there is hardly one from which any man of common sense would dissent—so thoroughly true and evident is this language, that it amounts almost to common-place. Napoleon the Third must therefore have a particular object in view, when he comes forth so solemnly to affirm what no one would venture to contradict in its general bearing. That object we soon discover, for every particle of evidence against Cæsar's ambition, or against the usual arts of bribery and corruption, to which he had recourse like all his rivals and contemporaries, is attributed to envy, or hatred, or narrow-minded prejudice, or political blindness. Of course, thanks to this method, Cæsar stands out blameless, emblazoned in a sort of immaculate halo, something like the halo, we fancy, with which the imperial biographer surrounds the eminent founder of his own dynasty. Nay, we strongly suspect, that had not a certain political Messiah of modern times been constantly looking over his nephew's shoulder, whilst pondering over the Commentaries, and Plutarch, and Dion, Appian, Cicero, and others, the very idea of attributing the same character to Cæsar would not even have crossed his Majesty's mind. But is this history? How are we to bestow our well-deserved admiration upon that bold figure of the old Roman dictator, if all his failings and his vices are thus white-washed, in order to satisfy this fine-spun theory?

Or how are we to account for the fact that a Merivale and a Mommsen—to mention them alone—have never been once struck with the same bright conception? They both acknowledge the great superiority of Cæsar over his competitors; they both admit the effete degeneracy of the Roman aristocracy, the unruly turbulence of the mob, the inability of the popular party to effect any real good, the utter disorganization of the central no less than of the provincial government; in fact, they fully acknowledge the necessity, nay, the existence of a real monarchy in the hands of Cæsar long before it was formally established; but they are not blind to the means, foul or fair, which he used to secure success. In our eyes, this is paying in reality a higher tribute to Cæsar himself than by inventing theories founded upon no positive evidence. A brief review of those troubled times will justify our assertion.

According to the author of *Julius Cæsar*, the latter left Italy for Gaul, merely with the view of increasing the influence of his fatherland and of subduing the most dangerous among those barbarians who had for ages threatened the very existence of the Roman Empire. How do facts agree with this bold theory? Shortly before this important event took place, Pompey had returned from the East, and might easily have seized the crown, if his innate irresolution had not constantly baffled his fondest hopes. "The diadem lay at his feet, he had but to pick it up," says, graphically, M. Mommsen; for the aristocratical oligarchy had been thrown overboard, and the popular party—though headed by Cæsar himself—was powerless to restore a genuine republican government. For a long period the Roman commonwealth had been hurrying on to an inevitable catastrophe, in other words to a monarchy, whatever form it might ultimately assume. The power of the Senate had just succumbed to the liberal opposition of the middle class, supported by the strength of the army. A new order of things was expected by every thinking man, though the old names, and persons, and institutions might be preserved; as for the rest, it was a matter to be discussed between the democratic party and the commanders of the legions. The Asiatic provinces had been newly modelled and regulated as to their administration by the victorious Pompey, whom the population greeted as a second Alexander, and whose freedmen or lieutenants they worshipped as so many princes. Thus, with his sovereign power, his vast treasures, his army, and his reputation, he really appeared in the eyes of men as the future monarch of the Roman empire. The late anarchical conspiracy of Catiline, attended by a civil war, had proved beyond dispute, that a government deprived of all authority, for want

of a military force, offered no defence against the grinding tyranny of the moneyed interest, no more than against the mob. So, according to all appearances, the year 62 B.C. (692 U.C.) would usher in a change of the Constitution, merely another term for the establishment of Royalty.

Doubtless, at this period, Cato, Catulus president of the Senate, Crassus, Titus Labienus, Cæsar himself, would combine against the Eastern Conqueror; but the latter was at the head of his veteran legions, and could reckon upon the support of all those in the city who had anything to lose, whilst the former could hardly levy a single legion in the existing state of affairs. The very aristocracy itself would have gladly given up their hollow and useless privileges, for the sake of rank, and influence and wealth in the sovereign's court. It is well known how all these expectations were brought to nought by Pompey's own supineness and vacillations; how he disbanded his army on landing in Italy; and how he soon became an object of contempt for every party, bearded by the Senate, cajoled yet deluded by the democrats; feared by none. From that day, we fancy, that Cæsar must have taken the measure of the man; for let us remember that his future rival had no real feeling of self-renouncement or true grandeur: he was deterred from realizing his ambitious views by nothing else but sheer pusillanimity.

And yet still he was Pompey, the only ruler of the day whose arm was powerful throughout the whole peninsula, thanks to his scattered but faithful soldiers; and to bid for an alliance with him against all comers was well worth the trial. Cæsar *did* make that trial, and was successful. During the political calm which ensued upon Pompey's return to Rome, the youthful head of the democratical party had made the most of his time to increase his own influence. But two years before, he was little better than Catiline, whose conspiracy he had certainly abetted;\* he was, moreover, on the eve of becoming a bank-

---

\* We borrow the following observations from M. Mommsen:—"According to evidence of the most indisputable character, Crassus and Cæsar, supported, more than any others, Catilina in his pretensions to the consulship, when Cæsar, in the year 690 (64 B.C.), brought before a court of justice the murderous agents of Sylla, he obtained a condemnation against most of them, but let off scot free the most dangerous and most infamous of them all—I mean Catiline. Doubtless, on the list of the conspirators, which was divulged in the sitting of the 3rd of December, the names of these two influential men are not to be found; but it is notorious that the informers had denounced, not only those who were prosecuted, but *many other innocents*, whom Cicero thought proper to strike off the list; yet in after times, when he had no interest in disguising the truth, he positively named Cæsar as one of the abettors. Another indirect but most significant presumption against both,



rupt adventurer. But since then he had gone through the prætorship, and obtained, with the government of Ulterior Spain, the means of repairing his broken fortunes, and of obtaining military renown as a victorious imperator (62-60). Even before his departure from the capital, his old friend and confederate, Crassus, showed himself most willing to enter upon a confederacy with him, in the hopes of combining their efforts against Pompey, the great object of the latter's hatred. So he consented to pay off a large portion of Cæsar's enormous debts. When Julius returned to Rome, with full coffers, to canvass for the consulship, he found the situation materially altered in his favour. The most keen-sighted among the leaders of the democrats were fully aware that henceforward the sword alone could bring about a change in the government, and they courted Pompey just as many a French democrat cajoles the modern Cæsar. But they were not in the slightest degree disposed to support him sincerely; they hoped, on the contrary, by playing off the one against the other to paralyze the two rivals, and to establish their own influence on the ruins of both, leaving out of sight that the situation of public affairs was very different. Above all, within their own ranks important changes had taken place, since many of their best

---

is the fact that two of the least dangerous prisoners, Statilins and Gabinius, were handed over to the care of the senators, Cæsar and Crassus. Had the prisoners made their escape, the public would evidently have held their jailors as their accomplices; if not, they would be compromised as turncoats among their own associates. But the following scene in the Senate throws a still stronger light upon the case. Immediately after the imprisonment of Lentulus and his companions, a messenger sent to Catilina by the city conspirators was seized by the government agents. On being secured against future punishment, he made a very full confession in the Senate. However, as he came to the circumstantial parts of his evidence, when he denounced Crassus as the originator of his message, the senators interrupted him, whilst Cicero proposed, not only that the affair should go no further, but that the informer should be detained in prison, notwithstanding the previous promise of pardon, until he should recant his deposition, and even make known the persons who had commissioned him to bring forth such a piece of slandering evidence. Now, here we have positive proofs that the man was well acquainted with the particulars, since, when incited to make an attack upon Crassus, he is said to have answered that he did not wish to take the bull by the horns; but we see further that the Senate, headed by Cicero, was unanimous in not pushing the investigation beyond certain limits. The public was by no means so chary; for the young men who had armed themselves against the incendiaries were incensed against none so bitterly as against Cæsar. On the 5th of December, as he was coming out of the senate, they levelled their swords at his breast, and he narrowly escaped the fate which he met, seventeen years afterwards, on the same spot."—*Roemische Geschichte*, 3ter Band, S. 181, 4te Auflage, 1866.

It will hardly be believed that the imperial writer takes absolutely no notice of all these circumstances.

men now admitted the necessity of a monarchical form of government, though grounded on free institutions and on the ascendancy of the middle class, which was, indeed, the soundest part of the social body. The future monarch was to be the representative of this ideal system, which Cæsar himself seems at this time to have partially entertained. But it amounted to nothing more than an idea, to be rudely contradicted by stern reality. The Roman body-politic was rotten to the core; what the Romans needed was an iron hand to govern them with military power, not a sort of constitutional sovereign. Of this truth the subtle mind of Cæsar must have soon become thoroughly convinced; hence his resolution to form for himself a strong army as the only road to power; nay, perhaps the only way of realizing his own views, which were doubtless superior to those of his rivals and contemporaries. So a coalition was formed between all these sundry elements against the aristocracy, who bought and sold their votes just as Pompey, Crassus, Cæsar, and their multitude of adherents, no less openly bought and sold their own. In this, as well as many other respects, there was no perceptible difference; the almost universal rottenness was daily gaining ground, and nothing could henceforward prevent the rot from doing its work,—no, not even a Cæsar himself. This fact seems to have escaped his Imperial biographer.

So Cæsar became a Consul, and made sure of both Gauls for five years, with the supreme command over several excellent generals, the rank of proprætor for his lieutenants, and many other important advantages. Certainly, not the least of those advantages was the fact that he could recruit his legions among a population well known for their steadfast opposition to the exclusive, narrow-minded rule of the Senate and the Forum. At the same time, measures were taken by the three grandees to secure the best positions to their subordinates; whilst, on the other hand, Pompey's veterans were supplied with lands in the rich Capuan territory. The Senate was thus held in check in the South of Italy; and, in the North, Cæsar was quite powerful enough to hold his own.

It must likewise be borne in mind that, at this period (58 B. C.), there was not the slightest probability of a rupture between the omnipotent rulers. Pompey's interest was to watch over the maintenance of those laws which Cæsar had carried during his Consulship; and the opposition of the Quixotic Cato did by no means contribute to loosen the bands between the triumvirs; for triumvirs they really were, however the French Emperor may object to the term. The moral superiority of Cæsar consisted perhaps in his honesty in regard



to the fulfilment of his own engagements, and this he did faithfully adhere to, as long as they stood not in the way of his private interest. We do not deem such an encomium a hackneyed one in speaking of those truckling times, and it could hardly be awarded to Cicero himself. A quality so very uncommon probably brought over to Cæsar more staunch adherents than his more dazzling qualities.

But as a proof of what that honesty was at the bottom, we must not forget that at this very juncture, the triumvirs instigated a prosecution against the famous orator who had put down the Catiline conspiracy, and they were the real authors of his banishment. It is well known how "the Father of his country" had been obliged to violate the legal formalities to secure the punishment of the conspirators. Yet the Senate had forced this breach of law on Cicero, though it shrank all the while from the responsibility of the measure. When the triumvirate became all-powerful, he did not, like so many others, bend the knee; nor even did he listen to many a wise hint, whispering in his ear, that he would do better to leave Rome; that he should be provided with a lucrative appointment, &c., &c. Besides, Cicero was a wit, and his pungent *lazzi* flew about the city like wildfire. So he was selected as a warning to others, Clodius let loose upon him like a bloodhound, and finally banished. It was no merit of the triumvirs if public opinion soon revolted at this piece of injustice and made amends by that unparalleled triumphant recall which does credit to the human character, but very little to the political Messiahs of the time being. We are indeed somewhat astonished to find Cæsar tarrying in the immediate neighbourhood of the city, as a support to Clodius in the prosecution of his nefarious designs. Let us drop the curtain on this sad tragedy.

The conquest of Western Europe is certainly one of the most striking events in the annals of mankind. It was the good fortune of the Roman aristocracy to establish unity in Italy; but in other countries they failed to fulfil the same mission. According to their ruling idea, foreign nations were considered rather in the light of booty and a source of fortune for the most influential members of the nobility:—hence arose that system of extortion which made the name of a Roman proconsul odious throughout the whole world. On the contrary, it was the peculiar glory of the Democracy or Monarchy—for they both go hand in hand—to adopt a different policy. What the irresistible power of the Roman government had prepared in the East and West; what the system of Roman colonization had continued—thus gradually carrying towards

the West a higher degree of civilization—was followed up with renewed vigour by the popular party. Caius Gracchus, its eminent founder, had first initiated the movement; but the time was come when it was to be fully developed. The two leading principles of the new policy may be thus laid down:—To concentrate and unify wherever the Greco-Roman civilization already ruled supreme; to colonize wherever the contrary was the case. In the times of the Gracchi, a victorious general, Flaccus, had applied the system to Southern Gaul; but the reactionary period which ensued, acted as a drawback on its completion. The Roman Empire remained, in many regions, an immense tract of land, thinly inhabited, badly governed, and without any definite limits. Spain and the Greco-Asiatic possessions along the Mediterranean shores were scarcely distinguishable from the mother country; but in the interior, and on the coast of Northern Africa, the Roman domination was insulated among whole tribes of semi-barbarous and nomadic nations. This was particularly the case with Carthage and Cyrene, and the same may be said of inland Spain. It seems astonishing that the government should not have followed up a policy of concentration, and yet so it was: the gradual decline of the navy even loosened more and more the link between Rome and these outlying possessions. When the popular party recovered a momentary ascendancy with Marius, the old plans of Gracchus were resumed; but this was, of course, of short duration. However, the downfall of the Syllan constitution, towards the year 78 B.C., enabled the Democratic leaders to return to these plans with greater efficiency. First of all, the restoration of the Roman rule on the shores of the Mediterranean was thoroughly effected, and then established throughout the East, reaching to the banks of the Euphrates. But the work of extending Roman civilization beyond the Alps, and of shutting out from the North and West the Gallic and Teutonic barbarians—a work still unaccomplished—was undertaken by Caius Julius Cæsar. It would alike be committing an historical error and a blunder against common sense, to maintain that the great conqueror of the Western World had no other object in view but to form an army for himself, considering the Gauls as a military school for his soldiers, as may be the case with Napoleon the Third in regard to Algeria. Undoubtedly, he was not the man to lose sight of this great design, as a means of establishing his own autocracy at no distant period; yet, as he was not a vulgar mind, but, on the contrary, a soaring genius, he used the very means he collected for his own purposes to attain a higher end than that of private interest. Granting that Cæsar required a

large military force for his own party views, still, the conquest of Gaul, at least, he did not effect with a party spirit. As the Imperial writer very justly observes, the Romans were under a stringent necessity of repelling, once for all, the ever-surging invasions of the Germans, were it but to secure the blessings of peace to themselves. This was, certainly, a high and most important aim; nevertheless there was one still higher, which Cæsar fully apprehended. In former times, when Latium grew too narrow for the multitude and activity of the Roman population, the intelligent policy of the Senate had provided new homes for them by the conquest of Italy. Now that Italy became, in its turn, too small to contain the tide of emigration, the same system was to go on, but on a more extensive scale, and commensurate with the important changes that had taken place in the social status of Rome itself. So when Cæsar crossed the Alps, he was fired with a noble idea, with a lofty aspiration—that of winning for his countrymen an unbounded supply of new settlements; for the Senate, a new source of regeneration, through the infusion of new blood among its members, by the adjunction of more vigorous races.

Thus we do full justice to Cæsar's genius and Cæsar's high qualifications for his undertaking. We are not among those whom His Majesty accuses of envying glory; nay, more, we consider the Roman conqueror as one of the fittest instruments, in the hands of Providence, for preparing the advent of the sole and true Messiah, who alone renewed the face of the earth. That either Cæsar or any of his followers could not have the slightest idea of such a contingency is self-evident, but we, who live under the Christian dispensation, can read it fully in no less evident characters, and we are entitled to affirm that he who is blind to the fact is the very first to narrow the bounds of history within the most limited compass. Above all, we must once more enter our protest against a theory which makes of Cæsar a demigod, moving in a dreamy land above common mortals, unassailed by common passions, untainted by common vices. Unfortunately, on more than one occasion, his conduct proved the contrary. When it suited his purpose, he knew how to stoop to the most ignoble intrigues—to bribery, to public and secret corruption, to the murderer's dagger, to all those guilty actions, in fact, which are the usual accompaniments of an absorbing ambition, coupled with all-powerful means.

It cannot form a part of our present Review to follow the French Emperor in his highly-interesting narrative of Cæsar's conquests, though it would fully repay our trouble. M. Mommsen had already gone over the same ground in a

way which seemed destined to discourage all future endeavours in that direction; but the Imperial writer commanded resources, which naturally were not at the disposal of any private individual. The results of these researches as to the topography of Cæsar's battles, sieges, and expeditions have been embodied in the text, and in an atlas that is perfection itself. Doubtless, the Emperor's own opinion on many of these subjects is open to more than one objection; but still you follow him with a willingness due mostly to the clear brevity, and correct technicality of his descriptions. Here and there, however, we detect certain startling inaccuracies, which will probably disappear in a future edition.

Whilst Cæsar was successively subduing the Gauls, Pompey assumed in Rome the position of the prime triumvir. He was considered as such by public opinion; the aristocracy proclaimed him in private *the Dictator*; Cicero, taught by bitter experience, bent his knee before him; and Bibulus, Cæsar's former colleague, fired against him his most pungent squibs and sarcasms in the halls of the Opposition. In fact, matters could hardly be otherwise, for Pompey was incontestably still hailed as the first general of his age. Cæsar might be proclaimed a promising young soldier, full of talent and rising ambition; but then he was so notoriously unwarlike in his manner, he had altogether something so effeminate about him! Such were the current saws of the day; and who could expect a well-bred aristocracy to sift the platitudes that flew about concerning the obscure victories won on the banks of the Tagus or the Arar? So Cæsar, in the eyes of the multitude, played at first the part of one of Pompey's lieutenants, for the benefit of his senior general, just the same as a Flaccus or an Afranius had done in bygone times, though not with such signal success. Besides, leaving in the shade other circumstances of minor importance, Pompey ruled over the Roman empire, Cæsar over two provinces. Pompey commanded the soldiers and the treasury of the whole State; Cæsar had but 24,000 men, and only a small amount of money at his disposal. Pompey had been allowed to fix for himself the term of his power; Cæsar, though intrusted with his command for a lengthened period, was bound to give it up at the end of five years. On Pompey, in fine, had been bestowed the most important undertakings by sea and by land, whilst Cæsar had merely to guard Northern Italy, as a safeguard for Pompey's security.

It is well to remember this difference in their mutual positions, as it will enable us to take in at a glance the enormous advantages Pompey lost in a very short time. His

first duty and interest would have been to secure the tranquillity of the capital by a series of measures, which it was no arduous task to carry into execution. But in undertaking this, he had presumed too much on his own energy: to hold the reins of government was precisely by far too much for his capacity. In the course of a few months, Rome became the scene of the most scandalous anarchy, which reminds us more than once of certain days in the Paris of 1848. Clodius reigned supreme over the mob, whilst Pompey endeavoured to outvie him with his bands of freedmen, gladiators, and slaves, whom he let loose against the mob-king. Naturally enough, the arch-ruler soon became helpless and ridiculous, and this feeling, which rankled within his own breast, soon turned into anger and hatred. His very helplessness drove him into desperate measures.

In the mean time Cæsar had pushed on from conquest to conquest until he reached the Rhine and the British Channel. The report of these victories, flying one after another to Rome, like so many claps of thunder, could no longer be ignored nor pooh-pooched by the aristocracy. The effeminate and long-derided Sybarite had, all of a sudden, become the idol of the people, so that Pompey's laurels were completely thrown into the shade by those of his youthful rival. For a rival indeed now he was: no more an obscure adjutant. To be sure, both triumvirs were bound by closer ties than those of a political character; but yet what a difference already in their mutual relations! Now was Pompey obliged to seek for support against his ally, in order to match his power. To apply to the people was a sheer impossibility, for he had irritated the mob by his late quarrel with Clodius. His only hope was therefore in the Senate. "Besides," observes very properly M. Mommsen, "even a man of Cæsar's genial stamp had learned to know that a democratical policy was utterly worn out, and that mob-tendencies would by no means lead to the throne. During the present interval between the republic and monarchy, to set up for a prophet and doff the mantle which Cæsar himself had long ago cast off; to mimic the great ideal of Caius Gracchus would have amounted to downright folly. The very party which, at a later period, took its name from the democratical agitation, did not even weigh a feather in the issue of the forthcoming contest."\* It is hardly possible to draw a more correct picture of the crisis; at the same time, the above words flatly contradict Napoleon's

\* Mommsen's *Römische Geschichte*, 3ter Band, S. 295. Berlin, 1866, 4te Auflage.

theory, which makes Cæsar a constant representative of popular opinions and feelings.

So Pompey took his stand with the Senate, whose importance now began once more to rise in proportion. Nay, as soon as it became apparent that Cæsar did not so much aim at reforming as at overthrowing the Republican constitution, the ablest men of the popular party went over to Pompey's side. Perhaps at this very last moment, had these men been endowed with any degree of public virtue, energy, and talent, they might still have preserved from imminent destruction the long-revered institutions of their forefathers. With the help of the Senate, and the support of numberless republicans scattered throughout Italy, they might have withstood the power of the two arch-triumvirs. But Cæsar knew well with whom he had to deal. His gold poured in full streams towards Rome; and from Rome another stream of high-born, but necessitous ladies, of thriftless young nobles, of speculating, half-bankrupt adventurers, flowed towards Gaul, there to draw from the source itself, whilst those who were obliged to stay at home had recourse to Cæsar's agents, who were generous and open-handed to every man of any influence. They had strict orders, on the other hand, not to compromise that exalted name by intriguing with any demagogue of the mob-party. The very edifices which Cæsar built at his own expense in the city—edifices wherein the jobbing capitalists of the time found more than one source of profit, were in themselves a speculation. The same may be said of his splendid games and festivities. All this was making political stock for Cæsar, or for the future monarch, but had nothing to do with Messiahs, or ideas of reform.

Let us hurry on through the internal events of these years, which forced Pompey to throw himself once more, much against his own will, into the arms of Cæsar, and renew a second confederacy at Luca. The Imperial biographer makes much of this famous meeting, as a set-off in favour of his hero. Let us endeavour to see the matter as it stood, in its naked reality. Although Cæsar was informed day by day of every incident of importance which took place in Rome; although he watched the events, from the southern limits of his province, with intense anxiety, as far, at least, as the conduct of the Gallic War would allow, he was not yet ready to throw down the gauntlet. However, it was necessary to act at once with firmness and decision. The aristocracy was daily gaining ground, and almost denounced war against him, no less than against his two helpless colleagues. According to all probabilities, his return to Gaul would become the signal of decided



hostilities. So in April of the year 56 B.C., Crassus left the city to meet Cæsar at Ravenna; shortly after, they both repaired to Luca, where they were joined by Pompey. The latter had alleged, as a pretext for his departure, the necessity of superintending in person the arrival of corn from Sardinia and Africa. The most distinguished adherents of the triumvirs flocked to the provincial town, whilst a whole procession of noblemen soon set in from Rome, to the amount of two hundred senators alone, without reckoning other persons of distinction. Evidently, Cæsar held, at this critical moment, the very existence of the commonwealth within his own grasp. But that was a strong reason for not jeopardizing his position by any act of rashness on his part. So he used the opportunity to establish the tripartite alliance on a stronger basis. The most important commands after that of Gaul were awarded to his two colleagues, and their possession made sure of both by financial and military measures. Cæsar reserved for himself the prolongation of his own command until the year 49 B.C., that is to say, for five years longer. At the same time, he was authorized to raise his forces to ten legions, to be paid out of the public treasury. Now, all this was setting at defiance the authority of the Senate. But indeed this was not all. The future consulships, together with a body of troops, to be located in Southern Italy, for the purpose of awing the Opposition into obedience, such were the different precautions adopted by Cæsar for the future. All questions of importance being thus settled, he treated in a light, off-hand way every other secondary difference, and we may presume that his winning manners did the rest. Even Clodius was persuaded to send back to their kennels his political bloodhounds—not the least feat, by the bye, of the all-powerful charmer.

The whole negotiations and series of measures bear upon them the stamp of Cæsar's master mind. Throughout, they offer the character of a compromise. Pompey had come to him more like a political refugee turned bankrupt than as a rival. Cæsar might have at once declared the coalition broken altogether, or taken it up again on his own terms. In either case Pompey remained, as before, a zero. If a rupture did not ensue, still he was obliged to bow before his great rival's protection. Did he, on the contrary, break with Cæsar, he could but fall back upon a hateful alliance with the Senate—the most hollow of all combinations. We may pause here to inquire what reasons could induce the conqueror of Gaul to make such enormous concessions to his inferior and hostile competitors? Most probably, in the first place, he was not yet sufficiently master of his own soldiers to push them



headlong into rebellion against the lawful government of their fatherland, which they had been accustomed, from their childhood upwards, to serve. It is all very well to talk of political Messiahs, and of high-flown systems of progress; there are home-strung ties and feelings which men are not prone to break at once asunder. We firmly believe that such must have been the case with Cæsar, and the eagle eye of the statesman detected in his present situation a flaw that no other could easily discover. On the other hand, he would have been obliged to recall his army from Gaul before its final subjugation. To his credit be it said, he preferred the extension of Roman civilization and Roman power to his own immediate interest, however that interest, as a candidate for the throne, stood in the way of his brilliant victories. Finally, a feeling of a still purer nature may have inspired his conduct on this occasion; in times not very distant he had himself been helpless and unknown, in the same position as Pompey was now to him. The great man had then proffered a saving hand, and retired to the background, in order to leave free room to the aspiring youth. And then, had he not married, and did he not yet fondly love Cæsar's only Julia? In the soul of the statesman beat also the heart of a father. Doubtless, all these considerations, and fears, and views, swept to and fro before the great Roman's eyes when he resolved to conclude at Luca the second triumvirate.

It would be tedious to push on any further a review of Cæsar's acts and policy previous to the civil war, the period at which closes the second volume of his new historian. It would merely present the spectacle of the same ability, the same arts and tactics, displayed to serve the objects of an inordinate ambition. But as to those higher views for which Napoleon III. gives him credit, we must confess our utter incredulity on the subject, and we shall wait until he supplies us with such historical evidence as may justify these assumptions. Yet, this does not destroy our admiration for the illustrious man who was so decidedly superior to all his contemporaries, through his clemency, for instance, a virtue almost unknown to antiquity. Our object has simply been to bring down the idol to its proper level, by showing that its lower parts were not of pure gold. For that purpose, we have had recourse to the most indisputable authorities,—the same, indeed, which his Imperial Majesty had before his eyes, though he seems to have read them in a spirit somewhat different from what we understand by the word IMPARTIALITY. The modern History of Julius Cæsar, in fact, reminds one far too frequently that there once lived such a personage as Napoleon the First.

## ART. II.—CANON OAKELEY'S LYRA LITURGICA.

*Lyra Liturgica.* Reflections in verse for Holy Days and Seasons. London : Burns, Lambert, & Oates. 1865.

*Institutiones Liturgiques.* Par le R. P. DOM PROSPER GUERANGER. 8vo. Paris, 1841.

*Origines et Raisons de la Liturgie Catholique*, en Forme de Dictionnaire. Par l'Abbé J. B. E. Pascal. Royal 8vo. Paris : Migne. 1863.

AMONG the more obvious characteristics of the Catholic Liturgy there is none more striking, and at the same time none less realized in practice, than its division into times and seasons, and the accommodation of its services and forms to the peculiar spirit or genius of each. The Liturgy of its very essence is a public prayer; not the expression of individual intelligence or individual will, but the representation of what may be called the corporate piety of the whole Christian community. In the devotional exercises of the Liturgy, the individual feeling is merged in the common spirit of the corporate worship; and in the arrangement of its services provision is made, by the systematic adjustment of the several parts, for the adequate expression of every sentiment of love, adoration, gratitude, and supplication, which the Church as the representative of all her children, without exception, pours out before the throne of the Almighty Father, as well, or even more, for all, as for each one on his own particular behalf.

And this, although by no means the sole object of the institution of sacred times and seasons, is nevertheless one of its most important results. Not alone does it secure the completeness and harmony of public worship, but it provides in its all-embracing cycle a place for each in its turn among the manifold relations of the creature to the Creator, now bringing into prominence the mysteries of justice, and now those of grace and mercy; pouring out alternately the penitent wailings of the prodigal and the tender aspirations of the grateful child restored to a Father's love; passing in succession from Bethlehem to the Mount of Olives, from Thabor to Calvary; at one time appealing to the love of a Father, at another humbly deprecating the rigour of a Judge; but never, throughout all its alternations, losing sight of the great characteristics

of Christian prayer, and filling up, by this unity in variety, the whole circle of the wants and wishes of our dependent nature.

In truth, it is hardly possible that the public worship of the Church should otherwise adequately fulfil the threefold function of confession, prayer, and praise, which belongs to it, as the public voice of God's servants upon earth. The cycle of Church festivals is in itself, in a certain sense, the liturgical creed of the Church, in which each festival may be regarded as a separate article of her faith, and in which all in common receive the most unequivocal testimony and the most solemn sanction which it is in her power to impart. The same cycle serves to bring forward in succession every variety of petition which the common necessities of sinful man can suggest or prescribe; and by proposing for public reverence in the ever-returning series of Church festivals, each of the mysteries of God's omnipotence in the creation of man and of His mercy in man's redemption, it supplies, as it were, even to the most commonplace and unreflecting souls, unceasing evidences of the greatness and goodness of God, and exhaustless motives to praise and glorify Him.

And hence this distribution of the year into sacred seasons, each subdivided into its own special festivals, is not only found to pervade almost every form of religion known in the ancient world, but is carried out with curious minuteness in the Mosaic dispensation. The three great periodical feasts of the Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles, had each its own group of festivals, with their specified offerings, and other sacred accompaniments; and in each there is clearly traceable an appropriateness, whether religious or historical, either of the offering itself, or of the ceremonial which distinguished it, to the particular season to which it is assigned. In the Christian Church the institution is unmistakably of apostolic origin; and it presents from the very earliest date at which it can be traced, the same general characteristics which distinguish the sacred seasons of the mediæval and modern Church. The services of the Lenten period were already sorrowful and penitential; those of the Easter marked by triumph and jubilation. Among the usages which Tertullian, in the well-known passage of his book *De Coronâ Militis*, declares to be apostolic, although without warrant in Scripture, is that which forbids to kneel at prayer on the Lord's Day, or within the paschal season. The mystical associations of the festivals and seasons in which they fall, have always been a favourite topic of speculation. S. Augustine's well-known application of the text, "*illum oportet crescere, me*

autem minui,"\* to the circumstance of S. John the Baptist's feast being fixed at Midsummer, just at the turning-point in the length of the days, is a curious illustration of the tendency to dwell upon such analogies. The diversity of practice as to the propriety of fasting upon Saturday, which existed between the Churches of Rome and Milan, although it betrays a want of perfect uniformity in the application of the principle, is nevertheless a proof as well of its existence as of the importance which was attached to it; and in the progress of centuries so much had this feeling grown, that in the age of Michael Cerularius, the Latin practice of marking the contrast between the joyous and jubilant character of the liturgical services of the Easter-time and the sorrowful offices of the Lenten season, by the omission of Alleluia from the latter, was considered of so grave moment by the Greeks, that they made it one of the articles in that impeachment of Latin orthodoxy by which they sought to justify the withdrawal of their communion.

The various ancient liturgies, whatever may be their diversities of detail, are all, without exception arranged on this common plan; and it would be an easy, and in some respects not an uninteresting task, to point out, even in their very discrepancies, constantly recurring illustrations of the principle upon which the distribution is based. But the liturgies, as such, are forms of public rather than of private prayer; nor is it required, even if it were indeed possible, that the private devotions of the people should follow out the same details. Still it need hardly be said, that it is not merely possible, but even desirable to transfuse into private devotion the spirit of the public liturgy of the Church; and although there are numberless mystical shades of sense and feeling which it would be vain to attempt to popularize, yet, as it is clearly the intention of the Church to convey a lesson even in these general forms, we cannot doubt that that intention will be best carried out by endeavouring to accommodate even private prayer at least to the general spirit of the public liturgy in the several seasons. The great body even of more spiritual Christians, it is true, would be quite incapable of following the profoundly mystical senses of the liturgy and the accessories of the liturgy, which have been elaborated by Durandus and the writers of his school; but there are many broad and striking characteristics, as well of individual festivals as of the cycles of festivals, which not only may be appreciated by

---

\* John iii. 30.

the most simple minds, but may serve to stimulate and even to direct, what would otherwise be the most commonplace devotion.

And this result is partly secured by the use, as the guide of individual devotion, of the public service-books of the Church, whether in the original Latin or in versions for popular use into the vulgar tongue. It is attained also in part by the excellent books for meditation and spiritual reading, arranged according to the order of seasons and festivals, which now abound in every language. The Liturgy may be said to have two distinct functions—the didactic and the devotional: one addressing itself to the intellect, the other to the feelings: one designed to bring under view in a series of lessons systematically arranged, and comprising the whole cycle of Christian duty and the entire body of the moral teaching of the Church; the other appealing in succession to the various motives of action, and seeking to elevate these by considerations drawn from the higher mysteries of religion, and to impart to them force or tenderness by appealing to the imagination or the feelings. To the former class belong the Epistles and Gospels of the Mass, and the lessons, chapters, and short chapters of the Breviary. The key-note of the other will be found in the Introit, the Gradual or communion, and to some extent the collects or other prayers of the Mass, and in the hymns, antiphons, verses, and responses of the divine office.

It is only the former of these two uses, both equally important, that can for the most part be reached by the class of books to which we have referred.

The charming little volume which is named at the head of these pages, is the first instalment of an effort to provide for the other. We gave a short notice of it at its first appearance; but it is a work of such singular beauty, that our readers will be well pleased to have it again brought before their notice. It is, according to the modest profession of the accomplished author, an attempt to apply to the Catholic liturgy the method of illustration which has long been familiar to Anglicans as the well-known "*Christian Year*," of the late Mr. Keble,—not, it is true, carried through the entire year, as Mr. Keble has done, but, nevertheless, by drawing upon particular festivals from each and every season, presenting, at least in general, some illustration of the peculiar spirit which will be found to pervade each separate cycle of the festivals of the Church. Most of the festivals, besides their own special theme of devotion or of mystery, have a general bearing on the eccle-

siastical season to which they belong, and of this circumstance the author of the *Lyra Liturgica* has carefully availed himself, in securing the unity of the collection as well as the interest of each particular part.

The general theme, therefore, of Canon Oakeley's volume is the illustration of the spirit of the ecclesiastical seasons. He has done in poetry and in the supernatural order for the ecclesiastical year, as far as his present labours reach, what has been done in prose for the natural year, and in the order of natural science, by Duncan in his well-known "Sacred Philosophy of the Seasons;" and the subjects treated in each season, without filling up the entire series of its festivals, are yet in all cases selected from the season; and their analogies are developed with admirable taste and feeling, in strict accordance with their bearing upon that place in the order of the operations of divine grace which is assigned to the mysteries appropriate to the particular season. The book is not properly a collection of hymns, but rather a series of "thoughts in verse," the thoughts being "adapted to the successive seasons of the Church;" and, in explanation of the comparatively limited range of its subjects, the author professes that his purpose "is rather that of following out trains of thought suggested by particular offices and ceremonies, than of providing the reader with aids to devotion or the different celebrations of the Church in their integrity."

This theme, we need hardly say, is not new. Its doctrinal bearings, of course, have been discussed by most of our leading Church-writers. Father Gretser has left little unsaid upon the polemical question. Benedict XIV., in his well-known work, besides the dogmatical and historical bearings of the subject, has illustrated it upon the practical side from the vast and varied stores of his ritual and liturgical learning. Binterim, Selvagi, Zaccaria, Nickel, and many others, have treated the antiquarian view with a fulness and precision which were in some sense necessitated by the minute investigations and often one-sided representations of the long series of Protestant writers, from Bingham to Augusti and Guericke. Considered practically too, it enters, although in a comparatively commonplace way, into many of our most homely devotional manuals. But Canon Oakeley's special treatment of it may fairly be described as new, at least in English; and we cannot help regarding his *Lyra Liturgica* as a most valuable addition to higher devotional literature. It resembles in its object the well-known German work of Staudenmaier, "The Spirit of Christianity exhibited in Sacred Seasons, Sacred Functions, and Sacred



Art."\* But Staudenmaier, besides the poetical illustrations of the festivals and seasons, has also entered fully into the partly mystical, partly philosophical bearings of the Church calendar and the festivals which it comprises. Canon Oakeley has left his "thoughts in verse" to tell their own tale, and has added nothing in explanation of the spirit of the ceremonial which he describes, or of its connection with the order of God's grace for the salvation of man, beyond what is conveyed in his own brief but pregnant lines. And yet it is hardly too much to say that no one who reads the few verses which he devotes to the several sacred topics suggested in the circle of each of the seasons, can fail to catch from them the true spirit of the Church, and in many instances to apply them with fruit in the direction of his own thoughts to meanings and purposes which he himself had failed to discern, but the justice and appropriateness of which he must appreciate when once they have been presented to his mind. We gratefully recognize in the results of Canon Oakeley's studies of the Church calendar, the practical realization of that beautiful prayer with which he himself closes his introductory lines on sacred ceremonies.

Teach us, dear Lord, obedient to Thy rule,  
 To con Heaven's lessons in the Church's school ;  
 Lest, prone to earth and soil'd by sinful stain,  
 We touch Thy holy things with hands profane,  
 Forget Thy presence, though Thy steps be near,  
 And verge on angels' ground with less than angels' fear.

The *Lyra Liturgica*, which, of course, is divided according to the four ecclesiastical seasons, begins with the winter quarter; and the opening lines on "The Two Advents" abound in beautiful allusions to the connection between the winter considered in the order of the natural seasons and the mystic winter of the Church calendar. In the supernatural order, the Advent is happily symbolized as the—

Twilight of our year,  
 Sure token that the sun is near ;  
 When darkness melts into a light  
 So softly warm, so calmly bright ;  
 With threats of doom to sinners sad,  
 Commingling alleluias glad.

This is but one of the many analogies which can be traced between the natural and the ecclesiastical seasons. Stauden-

---

\* *Der Geist des Christenthums, dargestellt in den heiligen Zeiten, in den heiligen Handlungen, und in der heiligen Kunst.* Von Dr. F. X. Staudenmaier. Mainz. 1838.



maier draws out very beautifully the lesson which may be gathered from the Advent's falling in the period when the seed is cast into the earth, to lie in silence and obscurity for a time, in order to its preparation for germination, growth, and final maturity. Man, too, before he can receive the germs of heavenly life which his Saviour, whose coming the Advent, silently and without ceremonial pomp, is designed to solemnize, brings with Him to the world, requires a total renovation of sense and heart, without which the divine seed can neither germinate nor ripen.

And among the analogies of this portion of the ecclesiastical year is one which strongly resembles that which, as we have already observed, was traced by S. Augustine as the coincidence of the feast of S. John the Baptist with the meeting-point of the lengthening and decreasing days of the mid-summer; we mean the fixing upon the shortest day of the natural year for the festival of S. Thomas, the incredulous apostle. At this season, as Staudenmaier, with a curious but yet not infelicitous or ungraceful refinement of the analogy, observes, the days, as Advent advances, are becoming ever shorter and more sunless; and in the last week falls S. Thomas's day—the shortest day in the year, and preceded and followed by its two longest nights,—an emblem, he fancifully pursues, of the poverty and obscurity of man's life, and of the spiritual night into which human nature has been plunged by sin. It is not without purpose that for this shortest of days is appointed the feast of S. Thomas, which is rightly presented as a type of the unbelieving mind, and the timid and faltering nature of man when destitute of God's grace, as our glimmering existence resembles the doubting and agitated condition of the unbelieving disciple, before the actual coming of his Lord brought him peace and calm assurance, and converted his scepticism into steadfast faith.

Canon Oakeley has not alluded to these graceful and imaginative but yet instructive and touching interpretations. But he has brought out very beautifully in his lines on "The Two Advents," another mystic lesson, the justice of which must strike even the least observant mind. It is clearly not without purpose and significance that, in the cycle of the Church's year, the two advents of our Lord are placed in juxta-position, and that while the expiring ecclesiastical year closes, in its "Last Sunday of the Pentecost," with the dread "coming of Jesus Christ to judge the living and the dead," the new year of the Church should open with that merciful coming of Bethlehem, the celebration of which is inaugurated by the "First Sunday of Advent."

But Advent hath its double sense,  
 Its strain of joy and penitence ;  
 Since He, who once in mercy came,  
 Shall come to wrap this world in flame.

Then shall the dead awake, and all  
 Be gather'd at the Judge's call ;  
 And He the nations shall divide,  
 Like sheep and goats, on either side.

And He shall say, "Come, all ye blest,  
 Heirs of My kingdom, to your rest ;"  
 But to the curst, "Depart and go  
 Into the place of endless woe."

Judgment and mercy haunt our gates ;  
 But Mercy knocks, while Judgment waits ;  
 Full eighteen hundred years, and more,  
 Have fail'd to drain Love's bounteous store,

If like Thy love Thy judgments be,  
 Where, Lord, were sinners frail as we ?  
 O loving Judge, O Saviour just,  
 Remember that we are but dust !

O, spare us yet a little space,  
 To profit by this Day of Grace ;  
 Draw us by love, by mercy win,  
 Ere judgment come, and wrath begin !

The same impressive thought is carried through the lines on the "Feast of the Immaculate Conception," in which our Lady is presented as the patroness of the two Advents, and in which her true position in the order of God's providence for the salvation of souls is most truthfully and touchingly delineated. We refer to these lines with the more satisfaction, inasmuch, as having been published several months before the appearance of Dr. Pusey's "Eirenicon," the author has been enabled to use them with most happy effect in his admirable reply to that "Eirenicon,"\* as showing how accurately the Catholic devotion to Our Lady distinguishes that function of mercy, in its intercessory sense, which is ascribed to her, from the mercy of Redemption which is the attribute of her

---

\* The Leading Topics of Dr. Pusey's recent Work, reviewed in a Letter addressed (by permission) to the Most Rev. H. E. Manning, D.D. By the Very Rev. Frederick Oakeley, M.A.

Son alone, and how carefully it guards the appeal of the sinner to both alike, against "the danger of laying too much stress on the merciful aspects of religion."\*

Thy Mother's name, so sweet and full of power,  
Sheds o'er the sinner's night its gleam of hope,  
That Thou, the Guardian of Christ's natal hour,  
Wilt turn from us His judgment's fearful scope.

But woe to thee, that in thy mercy trace  
Deceitful hues of peace that ne'er shall come ;  
And in the sorrowing sinner's pledge of grace  
Forget the harden'd sinner's threat of doom.†

The same caution (as though its value in the controversial use which has since arisen, had been unconsciously anticipated) is repeated in the closing stanzas of the same piece. As our present object, however, is not in any sense polemical, we shall rather select the beautiful lines on Our Lady's well-known title from the Litany of Loreto—*STELLA MATUTINA*. Probably there is no single piece in the entire volume which better illustrates the scope and purpose of the author. It applies to their sacred and mystic meanings all the characteristics which this title of Our Lady involves, and we think the analogy between the "morning star" in the order of nature, and the Blessed Virgin under this title in relation to the Advent season, and to the cycle of the Church festivals of that time, is peculiarly beautiful and happy.

#### *STELLA MATUTINA.*

The stars retire, when first the sun  
His giant race essays to run ;  
Those lamps that stud the arch of night  
Wax pale before the fount of light.

One only star nor fades nor sleeps,  
But still her twilight station keeps,  
With eye undimm'd and beams unshorn ;  
The bright, the peerless Star of Morn.

When Christmas first reveals its light,  
The Church's firmament is dight ;  
Her stars still pave the wintry sky,  
A great and glorious galaxy ;

---

\* The Leading Topics, p. 80.

† Lyra, p. 17.

Martyrs and Virgins,\* Pontiffs bold,†  
 And Doctors with their words of gold ;‡  
 Then comes a void, as, one by one,  
 The stars retreat before the Sun ;§

Save that Apostle, whom his Lord  
 From chilling doubt to faith restored ;  
 Who now beside His Cradle pays  
 No tardy vows, no faltering praise.

But Mary all the while is there  
 In hymn, or antiphon, or prayer ;  
 Shedding o'er every page and line  
 A lustre, only not divine.

When Advent lessons first begin,  
 We muse on Mary clear of sin,  
 And in the Virgin's primal grace  
 The promise of the Mother trace :

And meet it were, and duteous, sure,  
 That Mother should from stain be pure ;  
 Who did, by high prerogative,  
 The Manhood to her Maker give.

For eight full days,|| with reverence due,  
 We linger fondly o'er the view  
 Of her, on whom the Father's eye  
 Dwelt with intent complacency ;

For, mirror'd in that glass, He saw,  
 Undimm'd by cloud, unspoil'd by flaw  
 (Albeit in creature's meek estate),  
 The Beauty of the Uncreate.

Years roll away—the Virgin pure  
 Is 'stablish'd, lo, in grace secure ;  
 Girlhood's soft bloom still gilds her brow,  
 But matron honours crown it now.¶

\* S. Bibiana.

† S. Ambrose.

‡ S. Peter Chrysologus.

§ The Festivals of the Saints become rarer as Advent advances ; and there is none between December 16th and Christmas Day, with the exception of that of S. Thomas the Apostle. The Feast of the "Expectation" is noticed later. The Blessed Virgin, meanwhile, is commemorated throughout Advent in the Office of the Season.

|| Octave of the Immaculate Conception.

¶ The Feast of the Expectation follows the Octave of the Immaculate Conception after two days' interval.

"Mary in hope"—O Mother-Maid,  
What thoughts thy wondering heart pervade !  
But wait awhile, and God will ope  
Visions, transcending e'en their scope.

Speed on, ye lagging moments, speed,  
Till joy fulfill'd to hope succeed ;  
And Mary's patient faith have won  
God for our Saviour, and her Son.

The "Eclogue" of Christmas embodies very successfully the spirit of the scripture narrative of the Nativity. But a better illustration of the proper subject of the *Lyra Liturgica* is the "Triple Mass" of Christmas. We do not remember ever to have met a more thorough appreciation of the sense of the Church services, or a more intimate identification with their spirit, than is embodied in this exquisite little piece, which, having as it were passed in review the chief incidents of the Advent, and the high mysteries of promise which they foreshadowed or foretold, bursts forth into an ecstasy of joyous contemplation in the presence of their actual accomplishment in the full and abiding glories of the Nativity. There is a dramatic character, too, in the structure of the piece which heightens its effect ; and the beautiful interpretation of the "Triple Mass," and of the place of each in the Church's commemoration of the mystery of mercy, which all alike record, is one of the happiest examples of the "applied sense" which we know in the whole circle of the literature of symbolical ritualism.

# CHRISTMAS DAY.

## THE TRIPLE MASS.

"Drop down, ye genial heavens, your dewy shower,  
Dissolve, ye clouds, into a gushing rain,  
Bud forth, thou earth, Salvation's beauteous Flower ;"  
So spake the Church in calm imploring strain  
Day after day. And now her cry is heard,  
And, 'mid the solemn stillness of the night,  
Descends, O Father, Thine Almighty Word  
Forth from the realms of His imperial might.\*  
Bride of the Lamb ! put on thy strength, arise,  
Thy vests of joy, thy gifts of grace prepare ;  
An ampler tide of grateful Sacrifice,  
A sweeter incense of prevailing prayer.

---

\* Dum medium silentium tenerent omnia, et nox in suo cursu medium iter perageret, Omnipotens Sermo Tuus a regalibus sedibus venit.—*Antiphon for Sunday after Christmas.*

'Tis done. The Bride goes forth to meet her Spouse,  
And spreads her festive board, and dons her best ;  
With special rights her faithful Priests endows,  
To greet with worthier love her Royal Guest.

Thrice shall the Victim, Sov'reign Lord, to Thee  
Be immolated at each holy shrine ;  
In homage to the Ever-blessed Three,  
Whose purpose issued in this work divine.

And while this triple Act of priceless worth  
Pleads for the grant of Thine effectual grace ;  
Its slow unwinding gives to men on earth  
The various epochs of Thy plan to trace.\*

(Like Angels, who the Face of God behold,  
And at His Throne their duteous homage plight,  
Yet bear their high commission to unfold  
His deep economies to mortal sight ;

Or like the stars that pave the firmament,  
And chant their joyous lauds from age to age ;  
Yet turn on us their lustre, and present  
The various wonders of their jewell'd page :)

At midnight's hour,† prophetic mists still hang  
Around the glories of Messiah's Birth,  
Which David hinted, ere the welkin rang  
With the glad notes of holy angel mirth.

At dawn,‡ the shepherds tell with meek surprise  
How Heaven enwrapp'd them in its light benign,  
And how they sped to feast their wondering eyes  
On Mary, Joseph, and the Babe Divine.

But when the day§ hath come, Saint Paul shall preach  
Of Him in whom the Father's brightness shone ;  
And Holy Church the Word Incarnate teach  
In the clear accents of the loved Saint John :

Fall we on bended knees, and Him adore,  
Nor own His present Deity the less,  
Since veil'd in Infant form ; but all the more  
His Might revere, because we love His lowliness.

---

\* The three Masses of Christmas Day, regarded on what may be called their human side, set before us the Nativity under the different aspects of prophecy, narrative, and dogma ; and may thus be considered to represent the Mystery in the three stages of its historical progress.

† Midnight Mass (Introit).

‡ Aurora Mass.

§ Mass of the Day.

The "Epiphany" resembles, in its general character and spirit, the Christian Eclogue already referred to, and possesses quite as much of the true ballad character as is compatible with its devotional use. On the contrary, the espousals of our Lady and S. Joseph may appear to some too didactic for such a theme, although there are few who will not gladly dwell on the practical lesson with which the piece closes:—

Each year the Church her children true  
These chaste Espousals bids review,  
And cull their lessons sweet ;  
That while o'er history's page they roam,  
One sinless bond, one spotless home,  
Their wearied eye may meet.

Nor let such virtue's arduous claims  
Or scare our sight or daunt our aims ;  
E'en Failure's self may teach :  
Though humbled, we may yet admire ;  
Though baffled, still in faith aspire  
To heights we may not reach.

Who nothing dares shall nothing gain ;  
E'en they who tempt the boundless main  
Must step by step begin ;  
And he may Satan's work undo,  
And Eden's bliss in part renew,  
Who weeds his way of sin.

From the feast of S. Benedict, the great father of the religious life, Canon Oakeley has drawn a very touching lesson on The Twofold Immortality of the Saints, of which the saintly sons of Benedict were the first, and for a long time the chief teachers in the West:—

While thrones have fallen and empires part,  
Wearing their crowns of grace, that last  
In undecaying youth.

And he has made the First Sunday of Lent the occasion of a singularly pleasing and appropriate reading of the example of our Blessed Lord, as the type of the self-abnegation of the Christian. But we prefer to turn to the short but most appropriate piece on Palm Sunday, which cannot fail, we think, to approve itself to thoughtful readers, as realizing most felicitously every association, historical, ritual, and ascetical, connected with the day: the forest of consecrated boughs, uplifted in the hands of priest and people; the long procession, twain



and twain ; the mystic but highly dramatic halt at the church-gate ; the faithful "upraising their leafy swords" while the gospel is chanted ; and finally the appeal from the outward symbol of the martyr to the inner spirit which that outward badge ought to symbolize :—

## PALM SUNDAY.

What sweetly solemn pomp is this,  
Where joy and grief unite—  
The suckling's praise and Judas' kiss  
Blent in one common rite ?

The Church's range, to stranger's eye,  
Shows like a forest now,  
As priest and people lift on high  
The consecrated bough.

Anon they move to measured strain  
Of deep pathetic psalm,  
In long procession, twain and twain,  
Arm'd with the peaceful palm.

Not blithe, as when the fickle crowd  
Strew'd branches on the way  
Of Him, whom in their rage they vow'd  
When next they met to slay :

For how should Holy Church be glad,  
Who views with equal eye  
The triumph and its issue sad,  
So various, yet so nigh ?

We linger at the Temple gates  
To chant Thy praises, Lord ;  
For while we pause, the "Historian" \* waits,  
Thy Passion to record.

Stand at your posts, ye faithful bands,  
And mark the Gospel words ;  
And as they sound, with trusty hands  
Upraise your leafy swords.†

'Mid error's strife and war's alarms,  
Prepare to do your part ;  
Ye bear in hand the Martyr's arms,  
Then nurse the Martyr's heart.

---

\* The Deacon who chants the narrative part of the Passion in Holy Week is called the "Historian" (Chronista).

† The palms are borne in the hand during the singing of the Gospel.

Equally happy Canon Oakeley's interpretation of that touching observance of Passion-tide which prescribes the veiling of all statues, pictures, and other sacred representations in the churches. The usage is in itself highly suggestive; but we doubt whether even those who have meditated most profoundly upon it may not derive some novel association, some fresh religious impulse, some till now unfelt inspiration from the simple and highly poetical stanzas in which Canon Oakeley has clothed his own conception of the rite of—

#### THE VEILING OF THE PICTURES AND IMAGES.

The gleam of joy that dawn'd last week  
On sin's review, so blank and bleak,  
Was but the sun's retiring glance  
Shot on the dreary world's expanse,  
Just ere his glowing orb he shroud  
Beneath a sable pall of cloud.

Rise on my soul, perennial Light;  
Thou art not quench'd, but hid from sight;  
Thou hast but vanish'd for a space;  
Thou wilt Thy rearward steps retrace;  
Thou treadest, Lord, Thy walk of sorrow,  
To rise resplendent on the morrow.

Our pictures draped, in mourning guise,  
Thy darken'd lustre symbolize;  
And envious veils for once deny  
Thine Image to the longing eye;  
Truth's self must every shadow chase,  
Art fails to teach, and forms give place.

Away with sign and semblance now!  
None can express Thyself but Thou:  
Ye Saints, your 'minish'd honours hide,  
Withdraw before the Crucified;  
Nor let the bounds of sense control  
The vision of the ranging soul.

O suffering Saviour! fill my heart;  
Sin was Thy Passion's fiercest smart;  
'Twas not the cruel Jews, but we  
Who heap'd Thy chiefest woes on Thee;  
Our pride—our waste of grace—'twas this  
Which stung Thy soul like Judas' kiss.

More, more to Thee than scourge or nail  
Was that far-stretching deathful tale

Of human sin, in Eve begun,  
And to the Day of Doom to run,  
That, in the sad Gethsemani,  
Rose to Thy Mind's affrighted Eye.

Of sins completed and forecast  
The grim procession came and pass'd :  
The sins that moved Jehovah's ire,  
The sins that fed Gomorra's fire,  
The sins that perish'd in the Flood,  
The sins that shed Thy sacred Blood ;  
Nor least nor lowest in the line,  
Thy sins, poor child of God, and mine.

But we must guard ourselves against the temptation to multiply extracts, of which these sacred topics and the fascinating associations connected with them are fruitful. The summer and autumn quarters are still untouched, and we must leave it to the reader to discover for himself their many beauties. There is one subject to which we have not even alluded, and on which, nevertheless, Canon Oakeley is specially felicitous, and which he treats with an unction and an enthusiasm which cannot fail to warm even the coldest worshipper. We refer to the festivals connected with the Blessed Sacrament. The mingled feelings of love, adoration, and awe, with which he approaches this great Mystery of faith and life, are beautifully expressed in the prefatory lines on sacred ceremonies to which we have already alluded.

But most I love the pomp that gathers round  
The Saving Victim, as in love He comes,  
At sacerdotal bidding, to renew,  
In bloodless form, the Sacrifice of Blood ;  
Or mounts His Sacramental Throne, to shed  
Calm benediction on adoring crowds.  
For this doth image, in terrestrial guise,  
The Worship of the Lamb—a glimpse of Heav'n ;  
Where angels bow their heads, and veil their eyes,  
And wave their golden thuribles, and wake  
Unearthly music from their myriad harps.

And, indeed, even without this profession it would be impossible to read any of the poems in which he touches upon this theme without perceiving that for him its very name suggests an impulse which almost amounts to inspiration. In every instance in which he alludes to the Blessed Sacrament, or to any of the ritual or ceremonial observances of its

worship, he seems fully to realize the Christian conception of that awful but consoling Presence,—the Holy Sacrifice, the procession, the exposition, the benediction, the holy viaticum, the perpetual adoration. Not that he has dwelt at length upon any of these, or attempted formally to unfold the treasures of faith and love with which they are fraught; but he has often contrived by a few simple words and by a single turn of thought to stir up the very depths of that loving and reverential tenderness which is almost an instinct in every true child of God, which there needs no refinement of taste to develop, and no effort of philosophy to elevate, but which comes direct from God's own hand, and is at once the inspiration and the reward of true simplicity of heart.

We shall venture upon one other extract, which may in some sense illustrate what we have tried to convey.

#### THE CHRISTIAN PRIESTHOOD.

Draw near, ye Christian Priests;  
This is your Feast of feasts,  
Whence date the glories of your saintly line;  
When first the Incarnate God  
Himself on men bestow'd;  
And laid on you to guard and give the Boon Divine.

One at the altar stands,  
And lifts with holy hands  
The Victim pure, so loving yet so dread;  
O dignity immense!  
O joy surpassing sense!  
He acts his Saviour's part, and offers in his stead.

His fellows at the Board  
Have "eaten, and adored;"\*  
Heirs of His charge, and partners of His gift;  
Albeit they must forbear  
His privilege to share,  
And muse in silence on their high vocation's drift.†

What hallowing thoughts arise!  
What gracious memories  
Flow from that Act, and float around its source!  
As if the very place  
Were redolent of grace,  
Where Jesus first ordain'd and set His Priesthood's course;

\* Manducaverunt et adoraverunt.—*Ps.* xxi. 30.

† Only one Mass is celebrated in each church on Holy Thursday; and the Priests who do not celebrate communicate at it.

Thoughts of that service sweet,  
Which, bending at the feet  
Of those he call'd His friends, Our Saviour paid ;  
Thoughts on the favour spent,  
With unreserved intent,  
On him who shared the Feast, and then his Lord betray'd.

Where graces most abound,  
There sins are deepest found ;  
With John's affection grew Iscariot's hate ;  
The light which shines when used,  
Is darkness when abused ;  
The love which fires the Saint will steel the reprobate.

With this extract we must close ; but we think there are not many of our readers who will not be induced, by the specimens which we have laid before them with no grudging hand, to make themselves familiar with what remains of the *Lyra Liturgica*. It is, as we have already said, but the first instalment of a task which is capable of almost indefinite expansion, and we trust that, in taking leave of Canon Oakeley, we are but parting from him for a brief space to meet him again ere long in what is plainly a congenial field. He has, in the little volume before us, merely sketched the general outlines of his subject. The details which remain to be filled in are infinite in number and inexhaustible in attractions. There is one great class of subjects to which Canon Oakeley has hardly alluded, and which, nevertheless, overflows with topics of that peculiar character in which his poetical genius would find itself most completely at home. We mean the great sacramental and quasi-sacramental rites which exhibit most strikingly that union of the outer with the inner world, that contact of grace with sense, of spirit with matter, which form the very basis of ritual religion, and which realize in man's service of his Creator the true conception of that two-fold nature which he received from the hand of God. Such are the ceremonial rites of Baptism, of Extreme Unction, of Orders ; the benedictions, the exorcisms, and the personifications of nature and of the material elements with which this ceremonial abounds. The full poetical yet Christian realization of these associations is the true corrective of that subtle and seductive pantheism which underlies the religious æstheticism of such writers as Lamartine, Schiller, and even our own Coleridge. We know no Catholic poet who is more capable of presenting these associations in an attractive form than the accomplished author of the *Lyra Liturgica*.

## ART. III.—LECKY'S HISTORY OF RATIONALISM.

*History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe.*  
By W. E. LECKY, M.A. London: Longmans, Green, & Co.

IT has been said by a very high authority that the study of history is destined to assume a new aspect, from the application to it of a higher order of minds and a more philosophical method of treatment. We are passing out of the age of speciality into the age of generalization. Innumerable observers have collected facts, and innumerable speculators have multiplied theories; and we now seem to have arrived at that period when it becomes the proper function of the thinker to co-ordinate the stores of knowledge which have been set apart for him by others; evolve laws from the multitude of instances; separate the truth from the falsehood of conflicting theories; conjoin effects with their causes, and trace the half-revealed and far-reaching relations between distant and apparently unconnected phenomena. The influence of such a spirit—long felt in the less complicated sciences—is now, even in England, beginning to act on those which are more intricate. For history the time is rapidly passing away during which a great but much erring thinker could say that it was the unfortunate peculiarity of the history of man that, although its separate parts had each been handled with considerable ability, hardly any one had hitherto attempted to combine them into a whole, or to ascertain the way in which they are connected with each other. On the contrary, he said, a strange idea prevailed among historians that their business was merely to narrate events; so that, according to the notion of history in his day prevalent, any writer who, from indolence of thought or from natural incapacity was unfit to deal with the highest branches of knowledge, had only to pass some years in reading a certain number of books, and then he was, *ipso facto*, qualified to be a historian. The time is fast coming when those dreary and monotonous narratives of court intrigues and party cabals will exist only to memorialize an age when the history of kings was substituted for the history of nations, and the consideration of the actions of a few individuals for the exposition of the life of the whole social organization. History is growing to be less of a chronicle and more of a science; her

office is no longer thought to be confined to the registration of a few superficially prominent facts ; but the discovery, by a scientific induction, of historical laws, and the investigation of causes, is chiefly aimed at ; and, as the circumstances which have to be taken into account in such a method of writing history are often dismissed by the older school of writers as almost unworthy of notice, and are, moreover, exceedingly numerous and of almost infinite complication, a far wider and more diversified range of learning and a far greater power of analysis than were formerly either required or expected are supposed in the historian.

It would be idle to imagine that the influence of this more philosophical way of writing history will not extend, or has not extended, to theology. One of its first results has been the unpremeditated vindication by non-Catholic writers of the mediæval Church. And that naturally ; for the action of the Church in the middle ages was founded on their social state, and it was therefore only when history descended into the bosom of society that she could receive a fuller meed of justice. The Catholic Church has been more philosophically treated, and her primary attribute, that she is a kingdom, more perfectly realized ; while a flood of light has been thrown on the historical character of Protestantism, and to that farrago of heresies the conclusions arrived at have been almost uniformly unfavourable. Nor must we suppose that it will affect only the treatment of the external history of Christianity, and leave untouched the history of its dogmas. It has effected, and will hereafter, to a still greater extent effect, that both Catholic doctrines and heretical opinions will be studied not only, as heretofore, in their objective aspect—with respect to their evidence and connections one with another—but more and more in their subjective aspect, as to their influence on the minds of those who hold them. We have, to a great extent, yet to see the results of a profound and extensive study of dogmas in this light ; but to study them in this light is undoubtedly the tendency of the present age. We have thus opened to us a field of investigation almost new, and in its nature very different from the beaten tracks in which controversialists have hitherto followed one another. Whatever be the results that may be thus finally arrived at, there cannot be a doubt but that they will be fraught with immense advantage to the cause of truth ; and in the course of any researches that may be made into the subjective influence of individual dogmas a number of facts—hitherto but little attended to—will be brought forward from the most various sources ; so that it will exceedingly behove those who



have to attend to the defence of Christianity to make sure that these are truly alleged and represented.

Mr. Lecky, as we have before noticed, endeavours to apply to religious the more advanced method of secular history. He attempts to trace the subjective influence of religious opinions, the manner in which they mutually affected each other, and in which they acted or were reacted on by the other influences of their time. He does not pay much attention to the question of *evidence*, or to the arguments by which they were supported, except in so far as the use of particular arguments or lines of argument affords him some indication of the temper of the times of which he writes. The very idea of his work—a history of religious opinions—compelled him to attend to this rather than to the alleged evidence of particular doctrines: the latter being the proper province of the theologian as the former is of the historian. But from this necessary one-sidedness of his work Mr. Lecky seems to have been led into a corresponding one-sidedness of mind. Every one will grant that education, disposition, the opinions, and, still more, the tone of those around us, make it exceedingly difficult to treat religious questions on the sole ground of evidence; and Catholics are continually urging this against the Protestants who, by their denial of the infallibility of the Church, multiply indefinitely the number of questions which have to be thus decided; but Mr. Lecky goes further, and says that there really is not sufficient evidence for us, situated as we are, to come to a reliable conclusion at all. It is natural, therefore, that he should now and then take occasion to sift supposititious evidence and fallacious arguments; and in several places he states with great force the nature and logical value of the reasons given against some or other of the old doctrines now denied by Protestants. An instance of this may be interesting to our readers: the subjoined passage is taken from his second chapter "On the Miracles of the Church":—

If we ask, what are the grounds on which the cessation of miracles is commonly maintained; they may, I suppose, be summed up much as follows:—

Miracles, it is said, are the divine credentials of an inspired messenger announcing doctrines which could not otherwise be established. They prove that he is neither an impostor nor an enthusiast; that his teaching is neither the work of a designing intellect nor of an overheated imagination. From the nature of the case, this could not be proved in any other way. . . . Miracles are, therefore, no more improbable than a revelation; for a revelation would be ineffectual without miracles. But, while this consideration destroys the common objection to the gospel miracles, it separates them

clearly from those of the Church of Rome. The former were avowedly exceptional ; they were absolutely necessary ; they were designed to introduce a new religion, and to establish a supernatural message. The latter were simply means of edification ; they were directed to no object that could not otherwise be attained, and they were represented as taking place in a dispensation that was intended to be not of sight but of faith. Besides this, miracles should be regarded as the most awful and impressive manifestations of divine power. To make them habitual and commonplace would be to degrade if not to destroy their character, which would be still further abased if we admitted those which appear trivial and puerile. The miracles of the New Testament were always characterized by dignity and solemnity ; they always conveyed some spiritual lesson, and conferred some actual benefit, besides attesting the character of the worker. The mediæval miracles, on the contrary, were often trivial, purposeless, and unimpressive ; constantly verging on the grotesque, and not unfrequently passing the border.

Such is, I think, a fair epitome of the common arguments in favour of the cessation of miracles ; and they are undoubtedly very plausible and very cogent ; but, after all, what do they prove ? Not that miracles have ceased, but that, *supposing* them to have ceased, there is nothing surprising or alarming in the fact. . . . This is the full extent to which they can legitimately be carried. As an *à priori* proof, they are far too weak to withstand the smallest amount of positive testimony. Miracles, it is said, are intended exclusively to accredit an inspired messenger. But, after all, what proof is there of this ? It is simply an hypothesis, plausible and consistent it may be, but entirely unsupported by positive testimony. Indeed, we may go further, and say that it is distinctly opposed by your own facts. . . . You must admit that the Old Testament relates many miracles which will not fall under your canon . . . . But the ecclesiastical miracles, it is said, are often grotesque ; they appear *primâ facie* absurd, and excite an irresistible repugnance. A sufficiently dangerous test in an age when men find it more and more difficult to believe any miracles whatever. A sufficiently dangerous test for those who know the tone that has been long adopted over an immense part of Europe, towards such narratives as the deluge, or the exploits of Samson, the speaking ass, or the possessed pigs ! Besides this, a great proportion of the ecclesiastical miracles are simply reproductions of those which are recorded in the Bible ; and if there are mingled with them some that appear manifest impostures, this may be a very good reason for treating these narratives with a more jealous scrutiny, but is certainly no reason for maintaining that they are all below contempt. The Bible neither asserts nor implies the revocation of supernatural gifts ; and if the general promise that these gifts should be conferred, may have been intended to apply only to the Apostles, it is at least as susceptible of a different interpretation. If these miracles were actually continued it is surely not difficult to discover the beneficial purpose which they would fulfil. They would stimulate a languid piety ; they would prove invaluable auxiliaries to missionaries labouring among barbarous and unreasoning savages, who, from their circumstances and habits of mind, are utterly incapable of forming any just estimate of the evidences of the religion they are called upon to embrace. . . . To say that

these miracles are false because they are Roman Catholic is to assume the very question at issue.—Vol. i., pp. 173-177.

There is nothing, indeed, that is particularly new in this reasoning; our readers must have frequently seen or heard it urged against Protestants; but it is valuable in Mr. Lecky's history, as showing the view taken of the ordinary Protestant arguments by the higher class of anti-Catholic writers. In a similar manner he disposes of the vulgar arguments against magic and sorcery in a passage which, however, is, we regret to say, too long for quotation (Vol. I., pp. 9-16). He there concludes by saying that the evidence on that subject is so vast and so varied, that it is impossible to disbelieve it without what, on any other subject, we should consider the most extraordinary rashness. The subject was examined in tens of thousands of cases, in almost every country in Europe, by tribunals which included the acutest lawyers and ecclesiastics of the age, on the scene and at the time when the alleged acts had taken place, and with the assistance of innumerable sworn witnesses. As condemnation would be followed by a fearful death, and the accused were for the most part miserable beings whose destruction can have been an object to no one, the judges can have had no sinister motives in convicting, and had, on the contrary, the most urgent reasons for exercising their power with the utmost caution and deliberation. The accusations were often of such a character that all must have known the truth or falsehood of what was alleged. *The evidence is essentially cumulative.* Some cases, it is added, may be explained by monomania, others by imposture, others by chance coincidences, and others by optical delusions; but, when we consider the multitudes of strange statements that were sworn to and registered in legal documents, he confesses that it is very difficult to frame a general rationalistic explanation which will not involve an extreme improbability.

And now, passing to another subject, even Catholics may find in the following passage something worthy of being dwelt on:—

The world is governed by its ideals, and seldom or never has there been one which has exercised a more profound and on the whole a more salutary influence than the mediæval conception of the Virgin. For the first time woman was elevated to her rightful position, and the sanctity of weakness was recognized as well as the sanctity of sorrow. No longer the slave or toy of man, no longer associated only with ideas of degradation, and of sensuality, woman rose, in the person of the Virgin Mother, into a new sphere, and became the object of a reverential homage of which antiquity had had no

conception. Love was idealized. The moral charm and beauty of female excellence was for the first time felt. A new type of character was called into being ; a new kind of admiration was fostered. Into a harsh and ignorant and benighted age this ideal type infused a type of gentleness and of purity unknown to the proudest civilisations of the past. In the pages of living tenderness which many a monkish writer has left in honour of his celestial patron ; in the millions who, in many lands and in many ages, have sought with no barren desire to mould their character into her image ; in those holy maidens, who, for the love of Mary, have separated themselves from all the glories and pleasures of the world, to seek in fastings and vigils and humble charity to render themselves worthy of her benediction ; in the new sense of honour, in the chivalrous respect, in the softening of manners, in the refinement of tastes displayed in all the walks of society ; in these and in many other ways we detect its influence. All that was best in Europe clustered around it, and it is the origin of many of the purest elements of our civilization.—Vol. i. pp. 234-235.

“But,” he is pleased to add, “the price, and perhaps the necessary price, of this was the exaltation of the Virgin as an omnipresent deity of infinite power as well as of infinite condescension.” Here we have an example of the extraordinary mistakes which are occasionally made by Mr. Lecky. We by no means accuse him of intentional misrepresentation ; and in a work of nearly a thousand pages, of which there is scarcely a page without a note, and scarcely a note without six or seven references or quotations, it was impossible but that some inaccuracies should creep in. But he unfortunately often uses a looseness and generality of reference which makes his notes almost useless to any one desirous of verifying them, and his inaccuracies, some of which bear with them an appearance of great carelessness, are incredibly frequent ; while we desiderate in him that fulness of theological knowledge which a writer ought to possess who criticizes dogmatic systems so dogmatically as he does. In the present case he actually seems to think that the Blessed Virgin was regarded as an omnipresent deity because it was believed that she could hear prayers anywhere addressed to her.\* But the

---

\* In a note at the foot of p. 235 he tells us that “Even at the present day the Psalter of St. Bonaventure—an edition of the Psalms adapted to the worship of the Virgin, chiefly by the substitution of the word *domina* for the word *dominus*—is a popular book of devotion at Rome.” It is, of course, difficult to say what exactly is required to constitute a popular book of devotion, and it is quite possible that the Psalter in question may be used by some persons in Rome ; but it is not mentioned (as from its character it might be expected to be mentioned) among the “forty little books” sent thence for Dr. Newman’s examination, nor did the present writer, when in Rome, ever either see or hear of it. As to its being composed by S. Bonaventure, Catholic controversialists have again and again urged that it is

teaching of Catholic theologians makes a very great difference between the omnipresence of God and the manner in which the Blessed Virgin and the saints are cognizant of the prayers poured out to them on earth. The Scotists ordinarily teach that God reveals to the saints in glory whatever it is expedient that they should know; the Thomists that they see in the vision of God the prayers and the necessities of men; some have urged the elevation and expansion of even their natural faculties consequent on their entrance into the state of glory, but none have ever supposed them to be present, as God is, to the whole created universe. Mr. Lecky proceeds to state that before the belief that a finite spirit could hear prayer wherever offered was firmly established, it was believed that at least they hovered round the places where their relics had been deposited, and there, at least, attended to the prayers of their suppliants. In support of this assertion he quotes the following words as from S. Jerome: "*ergo cineres suos amant animæ martyrum, et circumvolant eos, semperque præsentibus sunt; ne forte si aliquis precator adveniret absentes audire non possint,*" to which he gives the extraordinary reference "*Epistolæ, l. iii., c. 13.*" These words indeed occur in S. Jerome; but they occur as the sarcasm of

---

spurious: to which we may add the testimony of Oudin (*De Script. Ecclesiast. Art. Bonaventuræ*, ch. xi. n. 26):—"Indignum porro mihi videtur, quod Sancto Bonaventuræ Doctori tribuatur." Nor is it even chiefly adapted to the worship of the Blessed Virgin in the manner stated by Mr. Lecky. In the words of the preface of the Roman edition of S. Bonaventuræ's works, "*initia coherent cum Psalmis Davidis, quæ vero subsequuntur Beatæ Virgini pulchre aptantur;*" and even in the very "*initia*" very suggestive alterations are made, v.g. Ps. 23, "*Domini est terra et plenitudo ejus: tu autem sanctissima mater cum Eo regnas in æternum.*"—Ps. 24, "*Ad te domina levavi animam meam; in judicio Dei, tuis precibus non erubescam.*"—Ps. 19, "*Deus, Deus meus, respiciat in me meritis tuis Virgo semper Maria,*" &c. We have found, moreover, the changes made in the body of the Psalms are such as to bear out the distinction adverted to by Dr. Newman, that the tone of the devotion paid to our Lady is distinct from that offered up to God in this, that the worship paid to the Almighty is supreme, profound, and awful; the language employed toward the Blessed Virgin is affectionate and ardent, as toward a mere child of Adam; though subdued, as coming from her sinful kindred. (*Development*, p. 436.)

We may also observe that Mr. Lecky uses the term "*Mariolatry*": a piece of very needless offensiveness at the least, but the less wonderful when we consider that he renews the effete charge of idolatry (*Vol. I., p. 236, &c.*). This kind of thing, however, is infinitely less dangerous than the habitual irreverence of tone, and flippancy of style in speaking of sacred things, which pervades the whole work, which indicates, both a great want of good feeling in himself, and also a great defect of consideration for others; and which has permitted him to insert passages absolutely blasphemous in character. (*See vol. I., p. 226, note.*)

an opponent which S. Jerome gives only in order to refute it. The passage is quoted from Vigilantius in S. Jerome's book against that heretic ; but the saint himself calls it a "portent worthy of hell," and argues in reply to the idea expressed in it, that we cannot set laws to God ; that the martyrs follow the lamb wheresoever he goeth ; that the demons wander over the whole world ; and are the martyrs to be shut up in a box ? As to the Blessed Virgin being regarded as a deity of infinite power and infinite condescension, those Catholic writers who in their devotional writings have spoken the most strongly of her power, have merely said that God will never refuse her anything she asks, and that she will never ask anything inconsistent with His Providence. Mr. Lecky shows in many other places the grossest ignorance of Catholic theology. He quotes, in evidence of the present belief of the Roman Church in demoniacal possession, a ritual which, he says, "is used in the diocese of Tarbes." He need not have gone to an obscure provincial ritual for proof of his assertion ; he will hardly find any Catholic theologian who denies it ; and the most used and best known of our modern theological writers has devoted a special chapter to the subject (Perrone, *De Deo Creatore*, Part I., c. v.) The doctrine of punishment by a material fire "still lingers," he tells us, "in the Roman Catholic manuals for the poor." If by this be meant that it does not remain also among theologians, this is not true ; Perrone, one of the most moderate, calls it, "sententia communiter recepta." (*De Deo Creatore*, Part III., c. vi. a. 3.)

In the latter part of his chapter "On the Developments of Rationalism," Mr. Lecky has put forward an opinion that the doctrine of the material character of the penal fire is closely connected with the ancient opinion, that the soul is in some sense material. The doctrine of a material fire became, he says, the foundation of an opinion that the soul is of a material nature ; and he refers to Tertullian, citing *De Animâ*, c. viii. This assertion is, however, utterly without foundation. It nowhere appears that this was the chief foundation on which this error was rested. Far from making this material conception of punishment the chief ground of his argument, Tertullian, in the passage quoted by Mr. Lecky, does not argue from the materiality of the fire at all. What he does argue from is the corporeal manner in which Abraham, Dives, and Lazarus, are represented in the Gospel ; from Abraham's bosom, the tongue of Dives, and the finger of Lazarus ; and he mentions the "ignis" merely in an incidental manner, and not to argue from its material nature, but to found his reasoning on the general proposition that whatever is susceptible of "fovela" or of



"passio" must be corporeal.\* It is, of course, quite conceivable that a writer, who believed the soul to be of a material nature might argue from the commonly received opinion of a material fire; but the origin of this opinion was in fact quite different. Some of those who held it even believed the "fire" of hell to be metaphorical. But before the advent of Christianity the minds of the people had been constantly and persistently directed to the sensible and the material; from the ranks of the people Christianity was recruited; and it is not wonderful if somewhat of their former habits of thought clung to those who were converted. It was only by degrees, and after a patient and silent opposition to prevailing habits of thought, that Christianity succeeded in spiritualizing religious conceptions; and the time which elapsed before this had been effected—a period of more than three hundred years—

---

\* After giving a number of philosophical reasons, he proceeds thus:—"Quantum ad philosophos, satis hæc; quantum ad nostros, ex abundanti; quibus *corporalitas animæ in ipso Evangelio relucebit. Dolet apud inferos anima ejusdam, et punitur in flammâ, et cruciatur in linguâ; et de digito animæ felicioris implorat solatium roris.* (The words in italics are those quoted by Mr. Lecky.) Imaginem existimas illum exitum pauperis lætantis, et divitis mœrentis? At quid ibi Lazari nomen, si non in veritate res est? Si enim non haberet anima corpus, non caperet anima imaginem corporis; nec mentiretur de corporalibus membris Scriptura, si non erant. . . . Nihil enim, si non corpus. Incorporalitas enim ab omni genere custodiæ libera est, et immunis a pœna et a fovea. Per quod enim punitur aut fovetur, hoc erit corpus. . . . Igitur si quid tormenti sive solatii anima percepit in carcere seu diversorio inferum, in igne, vel in sinu Abrahæ, probata erit corporalitas animæ. Incorporalitas enim nihil patitur, nihil habens per quod pati possit; aut si habet, hoc erit corpus. . . . (et aliquibus interpositis) . . . Sic et diviti apud inferos lingua est, et pauperi digitus, et sinus Abrahæ. Per has lineas et animæ martyrism sub altari intelliguntur." In another place Mr. Lecky quotes from Tertullian a passage (c. 30 of the *De Spectaculis*) as furnishing a striking example of the kind of disposition produced by realization of the doctrine of eternal punishment. Let the reader, however, compare the passage itself, with the context preceding it, with Mr. Lecky's comments (vol. 1, p. 356). Nor is Tertullian a fair example of the spirit of the early ages of Christianity; the contrast between him and the body of the Church is evidenced by the dispute de Coronâ, and by his secession to Montanism. Mr. Lecky, indeed, represents the early Christians as a demon-ridden race. "Wherever they turned, they were surrounded and beleaguered by malicious spirits, who were perpetually manifesting their presence by supernatural acts. Watchful fiends stood beside every altar; they mingled with every avocation of life, and the Christians were the especial objects of their hatred" (vol. 1, p. 28); where there is much more of the same kind. But Mr. Lecky ought to have remembered that if the early Christians believed in the presence and power of demons, they also believed in the presence and active ministration of angels and holy spirits; and, if he overlooked this, he might at least have remembered his own words at pp. 218, 219, that the general tendency of the early church was one diametrically opposed to a tendency to dilate on the sterner portions of Christianity.



was one of no little confusion in this regard. But no one seems to have been led into the error of supposing the human soul to be material by the notion of a material fire. Some believed this to be the case because they could not see how it could possibly be otherwise; they were unable to rise to the idea of a spirit, properly so called; they could not conceive anything to be real, and not material. That this was the case, in particular, with Tertullian, cannot be doubted, whether we consider his way of speaking in the whole book *De Animâ*, in the book *Adv. Præeam*, c. xi., and in the *De Carne Christi*, c. xi., or the pre-eminently sensuous and realistic character of his mind. The Platonic philosophy was another foundation of this opinion respecting the human soul. Some writers who were especially attached to Platonism, as Origen, explained the Platonic doctrine of emanation as meaning that God Alone is a pure Spirit, all beings proceeding from God having a trace of materiality greater or less as they are more or less removed from Him. They therefore believed all created spirits to be in some sense material; and forms of expression which may seem properly to belong to this opinion remained, as is often the case, long after the opinion itself had vanished. But the source of the whole error was, as is evident, the materialized method of conception of pre-Christian times.

But Mr. Lecky goes much further than this. He tells us that this opinion of the materiality of the human soul—which, if we except at most two or three writers, had certainly died out in the sixth, if not in the fifth century,—was the dominant opinion in the middle ages:—

Under the influence of mediæval habits of thought, every spiritual conception was materialized, and what at an earlier and a later period was generally deemed the language of metaphor, was universally regarded as the language of fact. The realizations of the people were all derived from paintings, sculpture, or ceremonies that appealed to the senses, and all subjects were therefore reduced to palpable images. The angel in the last judgment was constantly represented weighing the souls in a literal balance, while devils clinging to the scales endeavoured to disturb the equilibrium. Sometimes the soul was portrayed as a sexless child, rising out of the mouth of the corpse. But, above all, the doctrine of purgatory arrested and enchained the imagination. . . . Men who believed in a physical soul readily believed in a physical punishment, men who materialized their view of the punishment, materialized their view of the sufferers.

"We find, however," he proceeds, "some time before the reformation, evident signs of an endeavour on the part of a few writers to rise to a purer conception of the soul." And he goes on to attribute this to "the pantheistic writings that flowed from the school of Averrhoes;" and to ascribe to the

Cartesian philosophy "the final downfall of the materialistic hypothesis."—Vol. i. pp. 373-378.

It is not too much to say that the whole of this is entirely unsupported by evidence. Any one who likes to glance over the Coimbricenses *De Animâ*, the beginning of the second book of the Sentences, the questions *De Animâ* in the Summa of St. Thomas, the recapitulation of the scholastic theology on that subject in the third volume of Suarez, or the very earliest treatises *De Angelis*, will see that, far from there being merely "a few writers" who maintained the spirituality of the soul, the notion of immateriality was as well defined in the dominant scholastic philosophy as ever it was by Descartes; whose doctrine that the essence of the soul is thought, was clearly stated by the scholastics in the sense that intellection can only belong to the spiritual, and not to the material and the extended.\* The manner in which the Scholastics explained the punishment of a spiritual being by a material fire affords us a test-question on this subject. *Did* their "intense realization" of this doctrine lead them to infer the materiality of the soul? Certainly not. On the contrary; *because* all thoroughly realized the spirituality of the soul, all felt this difficulty regarding the manner of its punishment; but, although there was sufficient diversity among them as to its explanation, not one had recourse to the materialistic hypothesis.

Nor is Mr. Lecky correct in stating that the Arabian philosophy had a spiritualizing influence on philosophy and theology. That philosophy eminently favoured the "multiplicatio entium sine necessitate," than which nothing is more unspiritualizing. Some of those who held it expounded the doctrine of matter and form in a manner dangerous to the spirituality of the soul.† They held the perilous doctrine of emanation, and it would be quite a mistake to suppose that the description of error which they taught had any conformity of spirit with the poetical and sentimental pantheistic theories of the present day.‡

\* See S. Thomas Contra Gentiles, l. 2, c. 49, 50, 51, 65, cf. 66, where an immense number of arguments, in great part, of course, drawn from the philosophy of the day, is heaped up to prove the spirituality of the soul.

† See S. Thomas, Op. de Angelis, cap. 5.

‡ The part of the doctrine of Averrhoes which excited the greatest commotion was his psychology, which, together with his doctrine of necessitarianism, was the source of most of his other errors. According to the scholastics, the substances supporting and underlying the attributes of things are composed of two parts—substantial form, which is active, and matter, which is passive, and was said to be informed by and to receive the form.

It is chiefly from the character of the then religious art, which (of course) represented spiritual subjects by material symbols, that Mr. Lecky argues that the middle ages materialized all spiritual conceptions. Thus, in a note to p. 232, vol. I., he speaks thus:—

The strong desire natural to the middle ages to give a palpable form to the mystery of the Incarnation, was shown curiously in the notion of a conception by the ear. In a hymn, ascribed to S. Thomas à Becket, occur the lines:—

“Ave Virgo, Mater Christi,  
Quæ per aurem concepisti,  
Gabriele nuntio.”

And in an old glass window, now I believe in one of the museums of Paris, the Holy Ghost is represented hovering over the Virgin in the form of a dove, while a ray of light passes from his beak to her ear, along which ray an infant Christ is descending.—Langlois, *Peinture sur Verre*, p. 157.

And our readers will remember remarks of a like bearing in the quotation last given. Such criticisms are, however, to us merely evidence of so many curious misapprehensions. They merely show that an acquaintance with the history of religious art is but a very inadequate preparation for writing the history of religious dogmas. It is perfectly impossible to

---

Substantial forms are either material or spiritual: the material are “tied down to quantity,” or extended, in which they differ from the spiritual. But a far broader distinction than is now generally supposed to exist, was made by the mediæval philosophy between intellection and the lower cognitive manifestations of the mind. The latter could belong to the material, and be the result of organization; but the former was the proper and distinctive attribute of a spiritual form. Such forms were angels, and human souls. In the properly intellectual process they supposed two powers to be concerned, the *intellectus agens* and the *intellectus possibilis*. The *intellectus agens* was supposed to be an illuminating and revealing power: it produced ideas, and it was the function of the *intellectus possibilis* to receive and contemplate the ideas which it presented. Now Averrhoes taught that the human soul was corruptible and material. The only power it itself possessed he asserted to be a cogitative power. This was all that properly belonged to man—a function of the organic and corporeal soul. But this soul was assisted by a higher order of intelligences. The *intellectus agens* and *possibilis*, the operation of which we feel in ourselves, do not belong to us, but to certain separate spirits who co-operate with the inferior energies of the human soul, and it is by participation of their intelligence that we have intellection.

Averrhoes based his doctrine on certain passages in Aristotle's *De Animâ*, which are fully discussed, together with his abstract arguments, in S. Thomas's opusculum, *De Unitate Intellectus*. Their doctrine may be found, as usual, summarized in Suarez, *De Animâ*, l. 1, c. 12, n. 12, and the commentators in Sent. 1. 2, d. 17 & 18.

represent spiritual things in painting and sculpture otherwise than by material images. Nothing is more common than so to represent them even among Protestants of the present day; nothing was more common in the Old Testament, the very stronghold of the ancient anthropomorphites. We feel no inclination to deny that it is exceedingly difficult for the poor and the ignorant to rise to the conception of a spirit, and almost all mankind represent to themselves even the very Deity under some refined material image; but when such representations occupied a prominent position in public worship, there was an opportunity, and that frequently made use of, of correcting an untruthful imagination.

We have no hesitation in saying that there is far more unconscious anthropomorphism among the Protestant than among the Catholic poor. The doctrines of revelation make known a world akin to, yet not the same as, this; they tell of an order of things itself unseen, but possessing counterparts and shadows here. It is, therefore, not wonderful that there exists a constant tendency to forget that these are but imperfect types and symbols, and to remodel the truths of faith into conformity with what we see around us. To correct this tendency is one of the functions of the science of theology; and the conclusions of theology, infiltrating among the people, keep them from sinking into earthly and anthropomorphic views of religion, these conclusions being communicated by the ordinary resources in the hands of the Church, which, certainly, are far more efficacious in the Catholic than in the Protestant system. Indeed, of all the reproaches which have been directed against the theology of the middle ages, that of being in its spirit gross and material is one of the most unfounded and the most unjust. With far greater truth might such a reproach be directed against the Protestant theology of the last three centuries. In the middle ages, theology had a code and a standard of her own; she was the queen of the sciences; she regulated and moulded the ideas of the time. Now, condemned to occupy a subordinate position, she is content to take her ideas from those current in the world, and to use her terms, not in their proper and theological signification, but in meanings derived from the manner of their present use in physical science and in common life. An example of this occurs in the case of the word *person*, the loss of the theological meaning of which among Protestants has confused, if not obliterated, the doctrine of the Trinity. In Protestantism, the belief of the people lives chiefly by a tradition propagated through no recognized theological channel; a tradition which, consequently, daily grows more feeble and less definite; which is

continually becoming more and more corrupted, more low, and earthly, and anthropomorphous. Look at the common Protestant idea of the happiness of the blessed. The great Catholic doctrine which places the essence of the beatitude of man, not in a prolongation and refinement of the pleasures of this world, not even in the sight of Christ's humanity, but in that vision of God as God which is emphatically called beatific, has almost faded out of sight. They look forward to an earthly millennium, which is little better than a glorification of commerce, material prosperity, and natural virtue, to be succeeded by a heaven of which the joys very much resemble those which some Catholic theologians with Suarez\* assign to infants who die without Baptism. But against the reproach of lowness and materialism of conception being ever directed against the theologians of mediæval times, the doctrine of the beatific vision, which they so fully and so beautifully evolved, stands a perpetual protest. For in what was this coarseness and lowness of thought more likely to appear, than in their conception of the greatest happiness of man? Or who were more likely to teach what is far removed from vulgar and worldly conceptions than men who placed the sum of all happiness in the vision and fruition of the Divine Essence, which, according to them, could be seen by no corporal eye,† and in which was, they said, that joy which eye had not seen nor ear heard, neither had it entered into the heart of man to conceive? The whole of the scholastic treatise *De Deo Uno* is but another magnificent protest against such an accusation. The heresy of Gilbert Porretanus‡ would never be condemned by the Protestants of the present day; nor has ever the conception of the divine simplicity in perfection been so fully realized as it was by those much abused theologians. The mediatorship of our blessed Lord is now commonly apprehended by Protestants in a manner which makes a real difference of character between the Father and Son; but no one who knows anything of the scholastic doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation can imagine that these theologians would have tolerated for a moment a notion so frightfully heretical. With respect to Psychology, the scholastic age saw the death of Traducianism; and any one who has attended to the earlier scholastic opinions respecting the manner in which spirits suffer in the penal fire,

---

\* *De Peccato Originali*.

+ S. Thomas, in 1<sup>ma</sup> & q. 12, a. 3; and the other older authors in Sent. 1. 1, d. 1, & l. 4, d. 49.

‡ Lombardus in Sent. 1. 1, d. 33, 34; and the commentators *ad loc*.

will have seen that they are of a more "spiritual" tendency than those of most Protestant theologians.\*

Mr. Lecky's criticisms on the opinion that the penal fire is literal and material, and on the supposed general materialism of religious conception in the middle ages, have led us into somewhat of a digression. We have yet, however, one more remark to make. While he concedes that after the time of Averrhoes "a few writers" endeavoured to rise to a more spiritual manner of conceiving the truths of faith, he asserts that in the preceding period, before his influence and that of such sects as the Beguins had begun to be felt, the state of things was infinitely worse. From the sixth to the twelfth century materialism in religion was absolutely dominant. That the period preceding the advent of the scholastic epoch was one of great depression of theological science, cannot be doubted; and the amount of what may in a general way be called anthropomorphism current at any period is to a great extent conditioned by the want of general cultivation. But it is very easy to overrate this depression. The episcopal and synodical letters, for instance, which were exchanged concerning the subject of Adoptionism do not present to us theological science at, by any means, a low ebb. The same may be said respecting the controversy in the ninth century on the Eucharist; and the controversy on Predestination, if it do not reveal any large amount of historical learning, at least exhibits considerable activity of mind. Such of the writings of authors of that period as the present writer has looked into, show an amount of learning and acuteness which was certainly unexpected by him. That period was necessarily uncritical; but we regard the taste for allegorizing, then as formerly prevalent, to be an indication of something very different from a degraded and material habit of thought. The great teacher of the pre-scholastic age was St. Augustine, one of the most spiritual of the fathers; and the writer who was chosen to supplement him was S. Gregory the Great, who went farther than, and improved on, St. Augustine himself. And, as to the religious art of that period, Mr. Lecky has himself alluded to a peculiarity which, strangely enough, seems

---

\* Sensation and "sensitive imagination" appeared to the scholastics to be of so material a character, that they would not admit that these and other sensitive affections can exist in a separate spirit; and, consequently, those theologians who explained the punishment of separate spirits by the analogy of the soul and body, were compelled to admit that the pain must be different in kind from the "*passio conjuncta*."



to have given him no disquietude as to his general conclusion. In that period, he says:—

We do not find the smallest tendency to represent God the Father.\* Scenes, indeed, in which He acted were frequently depicted, but the First Person of the Trinity was invariably superseded by the Second. Christ, in the dress and with the features appropriated to Him in the representations of scenes from the New Testament, and often with the monogram underneath His figure, is represented creating man, condemning Adam and Eve to labour, . . . or giving the law to Moses. With the exception of a hand sometimes extended from the cloud, and occasionally encircled with a nimbus, we find in this period no traces in art of the Creator. At first we can easily imagine that a purely spiritual conception of the Deity, and also the hatred that was inspired by the type of Jupiter, would have discouraged artists from attempting such a subject, and Gnosticism, which exercised a very great influence over Christian art, and which emphatically denied the divinity of the God of the Old Testament, tended in the same direction; but it is very unlikely that these reasons can have had any weight between the sixth and the twelfth centuries. For the more those centuries are studied, the more evident it becomes that the universal and irresistible tendency was then to materialize every spiritual conception, to form a palpable image of everything that was revered, to reduce all subjects within the domain of the senses (Vol. i., pp. 224-5).

The most celebrated of the theologians of the middle ages is undoubtedly S. Thomas Aquinas. S. Thomas, however, comes in for an extra share of misrepresentation. At p. 72, vol. ii., we read of him, that he was one of the ablest writers of the fourteenth century—he died in the thirteenth—and that “he assures us that diseases and tempests are the direct acts of the devil, that he can transport men at his pleasure through the air,” and that “omnes angeli, boni, et mali, ex naturali virtute habent potestatem transmutandi corpora nostra.” Now all this is precisely what S. Thomas denies. In the first place, any one would imagine from the manner in which our author writes, that the great mediæval theologian imagined that, in the ordinary course of things, diseases and tempests are produced by Satanic agency. S. Thomas never taught any such thing, but over and over again refers both the one and the other to natural causes.† Mr. Lecky ought to have

\* We cannot ourselves, as Catholics, admit that there is necessarily the smallest impropriety or inexpediency in pictured or sculptured representations of God the Father (See Denzinger, n. 1182 and 1432); yet we may fairly argue that the absence of such, at the period in question, disproves Mr. Lecky's assertion that the dominant tendency of that period was anthropomorphous.

† *V. g.*, Comm. in Ps. xvii., and in Arist. Meteor. l. 2, lect. xvi.; cf. Summa, l. 2, q. 80, a. 2.



written "may be;" but the meaning of the words would have been very different, and their point would have been taken away. Secondly, while S. Thomas teaches, in accordance with Holy Writ, that the demons can exercise power over material things, he also teaches that they cannot directly change the qualities of things, nor produce any preternatural change except local motion: nor that at their pleasure; for it is a principle with him that God does not permit them to do all that which they have *per se* the power of doing.\* Thirdly, as to their natural power of transmuting our bodies. We have not been able to find the exact words quoted above, but many similar phrases occur in the *objections* in the ninth article of the *Questio de Dæmonibus*, which, it is sufficient to say, S. Thomas solves by saying:—

But on the other hand, S. Augustinet says, "Non solum animam sed nec corpus quidem nulla ratione crediderim daemonum arte vel potestate in brutalia lineamenta posse converti." . . . I reply that, as the Apostle says, "all things made by God in order," whence, as S. Augustine says, "the excellence of the universe is the excellence of order. . . . and therefore Satan always uses natural agents as his instruments in the production of physical effects, and can so produce effects which exceed the efficacy of the natural agents;† but he cannot cause the form of the human body to be changed into that of an animal, because this would be contrary to the order established by God; and all such conversions are, therefore, as Augustine shows in the place quoted, according to phantastical appearance rather than truth.

At p. 350 of vol. I., Mr. Lecky tells us that the mediæval writers taught that God would make the contemplation of the sufferings of the lost an essential element in the happiness of the blessed. He does not know of what he writes. It was taught that the essential element of their happiness—the *Essentia Beatitudinis*—is the vision of God; all else accessory and subordinate. In a note, to justify his assertion, he adds these words:—"St. Thomas Aquinas says, 'Beati in regno cœlesti videbunt pœnas damnatorum ut beatitudo illis magis complaceat.'" The quotation is not accurate. After quoting *Isaias*, ult. 24, he says, "Respondeo dicendum ad primam questionem quod a beatis nihil subtrahi debet quod ad perfectionem beatitudinis eorum pertineat: unumquodque autem ex comparatione contrarii magis cognoscitur, quia contraria juxta se posita magis elucescunt; et ideo, ut beatitudo sanctorum eis magis

\* *Questiones de Malo*, q. 16, art. 9, &c.; *Questiones de Potentiâ Dei*, q. 6, art. 5.

† *De Civ. Dei*, l. 18, c. 18.

‡ *I. e.*, which exceed their ordinary effects, because he can use them more skilfully (cf. ad. 11).

complaceat, et de eâ uberiores gratias Deo agant, datur eis ut pœnam impiorum perfecte intueantur.”\* The passage of St. Thomas, as given by Mr. Lecky, is just one of those which may very well bear either of two meanings. It might mean something very repulsive and very cruel. But the unmutilated passage can bear but one interpretation. St. Thomas does not say that they rejoice in the sufferings themselves; but that they are permitted to see them, in order that they may feel yet more intensely how precious is their own beatitude, and thank God the more heartily for their own escape. At p. 395 of vol. I., Mr. Lecky quotes from Wall’s treatise on Infant Baptism† a statement to the effect that St. Thomas asserted the possibility of the salvation of the infant that died, without Baptism, within the womb. “God,” St. Thomas is asserted to have said, “may have other ways of saving it for what we know.” No reference is given; and Protestant authors are, as is well known, generally unreliable in their statements respecting the Scholastics. St. Thomas teaches a contrary doctrine in the third part of the *Summa Theologiæ*, q. 68, Art. I. and II.; and Cardinal Cajetan, an eccentric theologian, but exceedingly well versed in the writings of the Angelic Doctor, who held the opinion in question, was never able to produce, out of the multitudinous writings of the latter, anything in his favour.

In a note to his chapter on the Industrial History of Rationalism, Mr. Lecky charges St. Thomas with what is nothing less than moral obliquity. The Duchess of Brabant, he says, had a scruple of conscience about tolerating the Jews. She therefore consulted St. Thomas; “who replied, among other things, that the Jews were doomed to perpetual servitude, and that all their property being derived from usury might lawfully be taken from them.” Mr. Lecky is inaccurate both as to the confiscation of their property and as to the perpetual servitude. St. Thomas does not say that all their property was derived from usury, and it would, indeed, have been rather a rash judgment in him to say so. But the Duchess of Brabant had apparently desired to impose new burdens on the Jews, and in writing to St. Thomas had stated that all their property seemed to be derived from usury; to which he replied, that *if this were so*, they might lawfully be compelled to make restitution. Nor does this by any means imply that all their property was to be taken away from them, as appears from

---

\* Supplementum ad tertiam partem Summæ, q. 94, a. 1.

† Vol. ii. p. 211.

St. Thomas's letter among his opuscula,\* and from his general doctrine respecting restitution.† With respect to the perpetual servitude, what St. Thomas does say is this: "*Although according to the laws the Jews be, or were, through their own fault doomed to perpetual servitude, and thus princes could appropriate their possessions as their own, yet this is to be understood leniently, so that the necessities of life be by no means taken from them. But since we ought, as the Apostle declares, to walk honestly in the sight of those who are without, of Jews, and Gentiles, and the Church of God, as the laws declare, compulsory service is not to be required of them, which they were not wont to perform in time past.*" He goes on to say that if ill-gotten goods were taken from the Jews, it would be unlawful for her to retain them, but they would have to be restored to those from whom they had been unjustly taken; and even under these conditions he declines to sanction any proceeding against them, but only "*si nihil aliud obsistat.*" Mr. Lecky also quotes, he says, the "*Histriones*" of St. Thomas. What the *Histriones* of St. Thomas are, we have not, we confess, the most remote idea.

Mr. Lecky professes to give the analyses of various theological beliefs and tones of thought which have prevailed in other times. Of these, however, he has had but little or no practical experience. He consequently puts before us only certain restricted points of view, which have strongly impressed themselves on his mind in the course of his studies and meditations. We are hurried along by his words as by a flood; but while the effects which some particular doctrine possibly *might* produce if it were held alone are vividly set before us, he totally loses sight of those other doctrines, which were organically connected with it, and modified and regulated its action. To evade one difficulty he falls into another: he concentrates his gaze on a point that he may see more clearly; but, confining it there, loses sight of those harmonies and contrasts, which make up the beauty of the whole. In one direction this defect has had very great influence. "*Veritas*" is, it is said, "*in medio*;" the present age has gone wrong all on one side; and Mr. Lecky, who is an advanced disciple of the present age, consequently considers that preceding ages have gone wrong all on the other. He sees that there is a very great difficulty in adequately realizing phases of thought so very different from those which

\* Opusc. xxii., in calce Opusculi de Regimine Principum.

† Summæ, 2, 2, q. 61-62, &c.

now prevail. And, because of this, he expends his strength on the points of difference, neglecting for their sake things nearer to his apprehension ; and the very natural consequence is that he gives us a distorted and exaggerated picture in which the common elements are not sufficiently brought out.

An instance of this occurs in his treatment of the subject of eternal punishment. The general disorganization and want of order which pervades his work is quite insufficient to account for the pertinacity with which he again and again recurs to the subject. Like the whole anti-Christian party, and very naturally, he detests the doctrine with his whole spirit ; and he allows this detestation to colour his whole views of the middle ages. He attributes to its influence whatever he finds, or imagines himself to have found, of a hard, cruel, and repulsive character in their theory and practice. He begins by misinterpreting the character of the doctrine itself. He separates it from the conditioning doctrines which were taught along with it, and which regulated and directed its influence. He dwells almost entirely on the terrible side of the then existing Christianity, and almost altogether neglects the operation of the concurring principle of love, the opposite pole of the Christian motives. And then he concludes that to its influence was due the severity of punishments in the middle ages. A universal terrorism was produced. The sense of the divine mercy was destroyed. The sufferings of the lost were at first regarded with horror ; but as men became more used to the thing, the horror was changed to indifference, and the indifference to a barbarous delight in the contemplation and even the infliction of pain. It will not require many arguments to show that such a method of treatment is monstrous. Mr. Lecky ought to have noticed that the causes which in the middle ages led to peculiar stress being laid on the doctrine of eternal punishment, were causes external to, and mostly in direct opposition, to the Church ; and that their tendency was met by a corresponding realization of an opposite pole of Christian feeling.

We cannot better introduce what we have to say on the severity of punishments, and the alleged callousness of disposition in mediæval times, and, indeed, on Mr. Lecky's whole criticism of the subject of eternal punishment, than by a passage from a most able writer :—

One of the effects of civilization (not to say one of the ingredients in it) is, that the spectacle, and even the very idea, of pain, is kept more and more out of the sight of those classes who enjoy in their full the benefits of civilization. The state of perpetual personal conflict, rendered necessary by the

circumstances of former times, and from which it was hardly possible for any person, in whatever rank of society, to be exempt, necessarily habituated every one to the spectacle of harshness, rudeness, and violence, to the struggle of one indomitable will against another, and to the alternate suffering and infliction of pain. These things, consequently, were not as revolting even to the best and most actively benevolent men of former days, as they are to our own; and we find the recorded conduct of those men frequently such as would be universally considered very unfeeling in a person of our own day. They, however, thought less of the infliction of pain, because they thought less of pain altogether. When we read of actions of the Greeks and Romans, or of our own ancestors, denoting callousness to human suffering, we must not think that those who committed these actions were as cruel as we must become before we could do the like. The pain which they inflicted, they were in the habit of voluntarily undergoing from slight causes; it did not appear to them as great an evil as it appears, and as it really is, to us, nor did it in any way degrade their minds.\*

The scale, in fact, according to which degrees of pain were computed, was much less minute then than now. This arose from the imperfect subdivision of labour in society, and the consequently more frequently recurring necessity of personally putting forth powers of endurance and of action; from the continual wars and commotions; from the imperfection of the mechanical appliances which now alleviate suffering; from a sterner and rougher manner of living, necessitated by the undeveloped state of the social arts; from the intimate intermingling of the civil and the military life, arising out of the feudal system; and from a multitude of other causes. To these, however, we must add another of far more potent influence. The inchoate mediæval nations were only emerging from a state of barbarism; and the associations of that barbarism still tenaciously clung to them, in the gloomy superstitions common among northern nations, in cruel ordeals, in internecine warfare, in the whole texture of their social and national traditions. The causes referred to by Mr. Mill were in operation almost as much in the civilization of Greece and Rome as in the middle ages; but this circumstance, which is one on which we need not dilate, increased, and must have increased, to an enormous extent the activity of the tendencies on which he remarks. If, indeed, there were two nations exactly alike in every particular, except that the one believed eternal punishment and set small store by pain, so as severely and even barbarously to punish offences, while the other did neither of these things,—we should in that case plausibly assert a direct causal connexion between holding the eternity of future

---

\* J. S. Mill, *Dissertations and Discussions*; Art. Civilization.

punishment and a hardness and callousness of temper. But we cannot argue in this free and easy manner, where the instances from which we have to make our induction are so multifariously different as are the social condition of the present day and the social condition of mediæval times. We must not thus arbitrarily single one from out of a multitude of causes. Reasoning from the known principles of human nature, we can say with all confidence that the causes just enumerated must have operated, and operated very powerfully, to produce the many and severe punishments, the carelessness for and of suffering, the trials by ordeal and by torture, which existed at the period of which we write. And thus we also see that those representations of the torments of the lost, on which Mr. Lecky expends such a vast amount of rhetoric, must have produced these effects immeasurably less than they would now produce; far more powerful means had to be resorted to then to produce an amount of feeling for which gentler methods now suffice.

Nor has Mr. Lecky fairly represented the doctrine of eternal punishment in itself. To contemplate the infliction of pain naturally produces, he says, a callousness and hardness of feeling. This statement embodies only a half truth, and the reasoning founded on it is in the highest degree fallacious. When the Catholics of ancient times contemplated the anguish of the lost, the habits which they endeavoured to form were habits of horror for the sin which entailed that anguish. There is a great difference between thus actively contemplating suffering, and beholding it merely in a passive manner, and with a view to some other end. The surgical operator, the public executioner, the soldier, who look at it in this latter light, may and do in time become hardened and indifferent. But it is far otherwise in the former case; and there is a great difference between reflecting on the pains of others, and reflecting on pains which may one day be our own. It is reasonable and natural to suppose, and it is found to be in reality the case, that one who contemplates the sufferings of others merely and purely as of others, and habitually avoids referring them in any way to himself, will in the end become hard and cruel. But the very essence of sympathy consists in an unconscious association of ourselves with others in their sufferings. The Calvinist, therefore, the believer in "assurance," who fancies himself to be one of the elect, and from his security safely thinks of all the torments of the reprobate as things in which it would be sinful for him even for a moment to imagine that he can have part, may but grow callous at the thought of Hell—may even delight to think of it, and revel in



the representation of the anguish there. But such a spirit is altogether opposed to the whole bent of Catholic meditation on that subject. The Catholic, when he meditates on these torments, thinks of them as of others, only that the thought may more vividly come home to himself; he thinks of them as of what he may one day have to endure. And again, the thought of our own personal suffering can make us hard and firm only when we consider it as a thing not to be avoided, but to be braved. It is almost a truism to say, that those men are of all the most soft and timid, who are continually representing to themselves means of escape from vividly-imagined dangers. And no Catholic would meditate on these torments that he might nerve himself to brave them, but that he might seek means to avoid them. Catholics, of course, accept, on the ground of God's Word, that awful doctrine of our Faith which we are now contemplating. So far as they argue for it from reason at all, they say that this doctrine is the necessary sanction of the moral law; and the force of that argument will be felt by none more strongly than by Catholics themselves, who, from holding the existence both of a future temporal and of a future eternal punishment for sin, are better able to judge what effects would be likely to be produced, if hell were, in the common teaching, resolved into a kind of purgatory. But it must never be forgotten that in the Catholic religion the doctrine of eternal punishment is taught under certain accompanying conditions, which intimately affect its practical bearing. The first of these conditions is the doctrine of purgatory, of which M. Comte thus speaks:—

Il serait facile de reconnaître que l'institution, si amèrement critiquée, du purgatoire fut, au contraire, très-heureusement introduite, dans la pratique sociale du Catholicisme, à titre d'indispensable correctif fondamental de l'éternité des peines futures; car, autrement, cette éternité, sans laquelle les prescriptions religieuses ne pouvaient être efficaces, eût évidemment déterminé souvent ou un relâchement funeste, ou un effroyable désespoir, également dangereux l'un et l'autre pour l'individu et pour la société, et entre lesquels le génie Catholique est parvenu à organiser cette ingénieuse issue, qui permettait de graduer immédiatement, avec une scrupuleuse précision, l'application effective du procédé religieux aux convenances de chaque cas réel.\*

In reading this quotation, it must be remembered that M. Comte was not a Catholic, and regarded the Catholic Church as merely a human institution. But, the truths to which that unhappy thinker here draws attention, are so evident, that they hardly require proof. If the sole future

---

\* Philosophie Positive, vol. v. p. 269 (Ed. 1864).



punishment of sin be believed to be an eternal punishment, such as is that of hell, it is not difficult to perceive what effects will follow. The timid, and those who are naturally religiously minded, will form a gloomy and austere notion of religion, which will produce some of the effects noted by Mr. Lecky, and in the end, by provoking a necessary reaction, work the destruction of all religion whatever. Those, on the contrary, who are irreligiously inclined, will be still further moved to give up all idea of religion as impracticable, and will be disgusted by its tone and spirit; while the doctrine of eternal punishment will lose its force by being applied to light and trivial offences.

But we must also notice another condition of the realization of this doctrine, which is provided in the Catholic system; and which, like that of Purgatory, has been rather neglected by Protestantism. It has been noticed by some writers that the sacramental system of the Church provides an admirable safeguard, and one in an especial manner necessary in the Middle Ages, against outbreaks of fanaticism. According to the teaching of the Catholic Church, the Sacraments are the great means, channels, and conditions of grace. And this produces a system and an order, a definite method of procedure in the spiritual life, which, assisted by the ascetical and mystical theology so minutely cultivated, abundantly directs enthusiasm and represses fanaticism. And we do not doubt that if Protestantism, with its doctrine of private judgment and private direction, had been the form of Christianity existing in the Middle Ages, Christianity would have sunk into a condition of which Paganism and the Gnostic heresies alone afford a parallel. But this sacramental system has also another, though a co-ordinate effect. Grace is insensible and unfelt; to confound it with the natural religious feelings and emotions is to make religion no longer a discipline and a duty, but a sentiment. And because it is unfelt, it is necessary that it should ordinarily be given through some external and sensible rite, in order to ward off undue and pernicious doubt and anxiety. Now, according to Catholic teaching, while, on the one hand, it is impossible for any one to know with absolute certainty what is his spiritual state before God; on the other hand, the doctrine of confession and absolution supplies all with a means of knowing, with a greater or less amount of probability, what their real condition is. On the morally beneficial tendency of the first part of this teaching it is unnecessary to dilate, and any scrupulosity or vain terror which, if it stood alone, it might excite, is amply provided against by the second. And thus, through the correlative doctrines of purgatory, of the consequent dis-

inction between mortal and venial sins, of confession an absolution, and by means of its moral theology, Catholicism provides that the doctrine of eternal punishment shall press with greater or less force, exactly as its influence is more or less required. It does not leave the believer to the diseased imaginations of his own mind, but provides an external code to which he must submit, and an external direction by which he will be guided. It provides a means by which he may know whether he is or is not in a state of sin, and a definite remedy whereby he may extricate himself from it; while it holds out a hope of salvation to all, and teaches that no man ever existed whose case was so desperate that he could not, if he co-operated with grace, as he has the power of co-operating, look for pardon. With the heretical sects the case is widely different. The very name of Calvinism calls up associations on which it would be painful to dwell. The conjunction of the doctrines of eternal punishment and necessitarianism must always, even where these doctrines are but to a very inadequate extent realized, produce a type of religious thought and feeling as repulsive as it is degrading. Of this it would be superfluous to speak. But Protestantism repudiated the practice of confession and the doctrine of absolution. Then, indeed, wherever the eternity of punishment was realized, it produced a diseased and unhealthy state of mind. Anxiety, doubt, terror, were necessarily the predominating feelings in the minds of men; an anxiety which could be calmed no longer now that there was no confessional, and a doubt which admitted of no direction now that each man had to be almost entirely his own counsellor, while all were faltering and divided as to the "direction of the ways of life." The "doctrine of final assurance" was, indeed, put forward to remedy the evil. But that doctrine only served to aggravate it. For to one class of minds it only supplied a new cause of terror; and to another it gave a very fruitful occasion of cultivating a disposition perhaps the most detestably proud, callous, and selfish, which has ever appeared among mankind.

We must not, however, be supposed to deny that, through causes the character of which may partially be gathered from the preceding remarks, the doctrine of eternal punishment was very prominent in the middle ages. And how, it will be asked, did the Church of those ages meet this extraordinary prominence? To have met it by merely insisting on the blessedness of heaven, would obviously have been most inadequate. Our natural constitution, and the circumstances of our life here, are such that our ideas of happiness, and especially of permanent happiness, are, as it has often been urged, far less definite and far

less acute than our ideas of pain; and for this reason it has been wisely brought about that what has been made known to us of the blessedness of heaven is far less definite and complete, than is what we know of the punishment of the wicked. But for this very reason, the prominence of the doctrine of their eternal punishment could not be efficaciously met by insisting on this blessedness. But there is another set of ideas and feelings directly opposed to the despair and unmitigated fear which would be produced by the sole contemplation of the torments of the lost; and it is a set of ideas and feelings which nowhere find so natural a home as in Catholicism.

From the manner in which the doctrine of the Incarnation is dwelt on in the Catholic system, and from the consequently almost human character which is given to the love of God and to the contemplation of the Divine Perfections as set forth in Christ, there results an ardour, an intensity, an active continuity of that love, which is simply incomprehensible to those who are external to the machinery of the Catholic Church. If it be asked, then, how did the church of those times meet the extraordinary development of the doctrine we have been considering, the answer is patent to the most superficial reader of the mediæval saints and theologians. They met it by an, at least, equal development of the doctrine of Divine love. S. Bernard, Hugo of S. Victor, S. Anselm, all especially breathe in their works this sweet and devout spirit. The writings of S. Bernard, and those passages of such exquisitely tender devotion which occur in the writings of S. Augustine, became, in particular, the texts on which succeeding writers expanded and dilated. A spirit of meekness and tenderness of devotion, an intense and fervid love of God, are the themes on which they peculiarly delight to dwell, and the virtues on which they peculiarly love to insist. It was this age that produced the "Imitation"; toward the close of it appeared the "*Paradisus Animæ*:" and whoever was the actual author of the former work, it possesses remarkable affinity with the spirit and even the style of Gerson. Nor was this temper of mind confined to purely mystical writers. The writings of S. Francis of Assisi, of S. Bridget, S. Catherine of Sienna, and others, attest, indeed, that the type of sanctity was, in some sense, changing under its influence; but it passed on to the great theological teachers of the age. S. Thomas of Aquino, the best and greatest of them all, lived and struggled in the very midst of the conflict with infidelity which was then agitating the Church, and yet even he found time to write a number of short spiritual treatises which display the most tender and the most delicate devotion. This is especially seen in his book

"De Beatitudine." Richard of S. Victor wrote a work "De Gradibus Violentæ Charitatis," "On the degrees of violent charity." S. Bonaventure received the name of "The Seraphic Doctor" from the ardour of his piety; the titles of a few of his works—"De Septem Itineribus Æternitatis," "Stimulus Amoris," "Amatorium," "Itinerarium Mentis ad Deum"—will be sufficient to show its character. The tender and loving spirit, which those great doctors manifested in their devotion, broke out also in their correspondence with their friends, as may be perceived even from the extracts from the letters and sermons of certain of them which the Count de Montalembert has inserted in his "Monks of the West." Other momenta of a more general nature show the operation of the same tendency. For the first time detailed lives of our blessed Lord came into general circulation. Devotion to the Passion assumed a far more prominent position than before; of the spirit which animated it we have a most touching example in the little book attributed to S. Juliana of Norwich. The Canticle of Canticles suddenly took a place in the affections of the pious, which even in the primitive Church it had never known. S. Bernard composed on it his celebrated "Sermones super Cantica," S. Bonaventure and Richard of S. Victor both wrote commentaries on it; S. Thomas has left us two, and it was while dictating the second of these that he passed out of this world, celebrating the blessedness of divine love. Nor can we altogether omit to notice three devotions, two of which certainly exercised a very considerable influence. In an age in which the spirit of love and devotion to our Blessed Lord had assumed such large proportions, in which the doctrine of the Incarnation was for the first time completely treated in a scientific manner, and in which the subject of original sin was more profoundly investigated, and the questions concerning the Immaculate Conception consequently began to be cleared up and to assume a definite form and coherence, it was natural that a great devotion should manifest itself to our Blessed Lady. And of the tendency and the effects of this devotion Mr. Lecky has himself spoken. The character of the devotion to S. Joseph, also, is sufficiently well known, and it was first, we believe, treated at length by Albertus Magnus. Devotion to the Blessed Sacrament was to an indefinite extent stimulated by the institution of the Feast of Corpus Christi; and it, of a truth, is a devotion which of all others breathes a spirit of tenderness and of love.

We can now only make a few concluding remarks. We have already given a general estimate of the work, on a few points of which we have here touched; for we considered it better to

speak of two or three connected subjects more fully, than to distract ourselves and our readers by flying comments on the many and very diverse subjects there treated. We have only explicitly to add what we have before implied, that we consider it a very dangerous book. It is all the more dangerous, because Mr. Lecky is not a furious fanatic; because of his spurious candour; because of his partial admissions; because of his engaging style. And in an age like the present, when the dogmatic principle is so bitterly attacked by those without, and sits so lightly on the necks even of believers, it is exceedingly dangerous. For, as was to be expected, it sets the dogmatic principle utterly at defiance, and from beginning to end is a continued protest against it. Mr. Lecky's idea of education, and his theory of the manner of formation of religious opinions, are alike thoroughly opposed to it. In education he would have the bare principles of morality only, as far as possible, inculcated; dogma, as far as possible, excluded; and if any amount of dogmatic teaching is unavoidably admitted, it is to be taught only so as to rest as lightly as possible on the mind, and with the proviso that the opinions then taught will have to be reconsidered in after-life. With respect to the formation of religious opinions, his book teaches a kind of Hegelianism. Society is continually changing, and the best thing we can do is to follow the most advanced minds in society. There is an everlasting process, in which we can never be sure that we have definitely attained to the truth. The end of this, of course, is to make all opinions uncertain. We may know what we like best, or what the tendencies of society incline it and us to believe; but we can never, as to religious opinions, know what is objectively true.

It is not very difficult to discover what is the nature of this process which is called Rationalism. In former times the religious spirit predominated over the secular; but from a variety of causes, and in particular on account of the immense development of secular science since the time of Bacon and Descartes, the secular scientific spirit has since predominated over the religious. And Rationalism is merely one of the results of this predominance; a consequence of the application to religious subjects of secular habits of thought. This may manifest itself, now in one way, now in another; in the denial now of Transubstantiation, now of the doctrine of the Trinity; but its root and origin is the same: it tends (and this quite takes the romance out of it) to the elimination of the religious ideas, and it is strengthened by whatever strengthens what we have called the secular-scientific, or weakens the religious, spirit. Hence that dislike of authority and that over-clouding of the

moral character of religious truth ; hence that distaste for the miraculous and the mysterious, and that tendency to put into the background, and even to deny, the doctrine of grace ; and if the internal wants of those who have just "escaped from the wilderness of Christianity, and still have some of the thorns and brambles sticking to their clothes," make it necessary that something should be substituted for that which is being taken away—a baseless and often unreal sentimentalism is substituted for honest religious duty and earnest devotion. It is only too much to be feared that the world will educate itself out of this also ; and that, in the case of those who refuse submission to the Catholic Church, the secular spirit will more and more grow towards its full ascendancy, and therefore towards a total extinction of the already weakened religious ideas.

---

---

ART. IV.—FATHER HYACINTHE BESSON, O.S.D.

*Un Religieux Dominicain. Le R. P. Hyacinthe Besson. Sa Vie et ses Lettres. Par E. CARTIER. Paris : 1865.*

"MY original purpose," says the author of this most interesting and edifying Memoir, "in writing the life of Père Besson was simply to perpetuate his memory among his religious brethren, and to preserve some personal reminiscences connected with the establishment of the order of Friars Preachers in France ; but, as I studied that sweet and beautiful countenance, I felt a glowing desire to make it more generally known. It seemed to me that to make men acquainted with P. Besson was to promote the glory of God. When he was on earth, the sight of him touched men's hearts, and made them better. Why not, then, make him known to those who never met with him in life ? Why not recall, as far as possible, the charm of his presence and the unction of his words ? He will still teach the lesson which he had so well learned of his Divine Master—to be meek and humble of heart. Neither was his a life devoid of external interest. It was associated with all things holy in his time ; it flowed like a pure, transparent stream amid widely-varying scenery in France, Italy, and the East. As an artist, a religious, and a missionary, he was alike distinguished by the beauty of his



intelligence, the activity of his zeal, and the devotedness of his charity. His virtues won for him a place in the great heart of Pius IX., and the infidels themselves venerate the spot where his ashes repose in the land of the Patriarchs and Prophets. To write such a life is to further the cause of truth, for the most persuasive evidence of truth is holiness."

The portrait of Hyacinthe Besson is traced with a loving yet a discriminating touch, by the hand of one who knew and loved him as a brother. The Dominican of the nineteenth century stands before us, like a figure in one of Fra Angelico's frescos, which he seemed destined to revive no less in his own person than by his art,—with the lily and the torch of S. Dominic going forth in the might of his gentleness, conquering and to conquer, by the threefold power of charity, purity, and truth. The *Monachella*, as our Holy Father loved to call him, in allusion to the feminine gentleness and purity of his character, was endowed by divine grace with such a masculine vigour and straightforward singleness of purpose, as commended him to the choice of his superiors, and to the illuminated eye of the Sovereign Pontiff himself, as the fittest instrument to cope with contending wills and opinions in his own Order, and to grapple with the still more perplexing difficulties attending the relations of the Holy See with the Christians of the East.

The father of Charles-Jean-Baptiste (in religion, Hyacinthe) Besson, an old soldier of the army of Condé, died of the consequences of a wound received in the service, a short time before his birth, in 1816. The first years of his childhood were spent under the roof of his maternal uncle, who seems to have belonged to what in England would be called the class of substantial yeomanry. He loved in after-life to recall to mind the images of that holy and happy household, in which customs lingered, long since swept away from all save such lonely and primitive spots as here and there had escaped the effects of the revolutionary volcano, or had been preserved, as relics of happier days, beneath the crust left by its scathing lava. The evening prayer of the assembled household—the men on one side, the women on the other, with the master and the mistress at the head of each division—the children kneeling to ask their parents' blessing, ere they went to rest—the abundant almsgiving—the reverent tending of Christ's poor by the wealthy and prosperous housewife, who counted it an honour to perform for them the lowliest and most revolting offices—all these are so many pictures from the ages of faith; but the most touching, perhaps, is that which belongs to an age of unbelief—the venerable religious driven forth from her



convent, finding her cloister beneath her nephew's roof, and her work in teaching the Christian doctrine to the merry-hearted children, who with hushed voices and soft tread gathered round the door of her quiet room.

A sudden reverse of fortune broke up this happy home. "The prosperity of this Christian household vanished, without exciting a murmur." M<sup>de</sup>. Besson was driven to Paris to seek a subsistence for herself and her child by the labour of her hands. In one of his touching letters to that beloved mother, P. Besson thus reminds her of those days and nights of toil and suffering :—

MY GOOD MOTHER,—Our Lord long ago marked you with the sign of the Cross, as one of the chosen sheep of His fold. I have never lost the sweet remembrance of all that we went through together in the street *Trois Frères*, though I was too little then to understand all that you suffered, watching by my side in those cold, long winter nights, with only a little chaufferette to warm our poor garret. You suffered it all with joy. Oh ! my poor mother, when I remember how you would take off some of your poor clothes, cold and weary as you were, to cover me, my heart swells with tenderness and with a desire to make you a return worthy of your love. Your unshaken confidence in Divine Providence gave you courage to overcome the hardest and most depressing trials.

These days of anxiety and privation were not of very long continuance. The mother and son found generous and faithful friends, by whose assistance, in the course of a few years, they were placed in a position of independence. The foremost of these was the venerable Abbé Leclerc, for whom P. Besson ever bore a filial affection only second to that which he cherished for his mother. Under the guidance of this holy priest Claude made his first Communion, and from him he learned that love of the poor which, throughout his after-life, distinguished him, as it had characterized his benefactor.

The Abbé Leclerc earnestly desired that the talents and high qualities, of which he discerned the early promise, should be consecrated to the immediate service of God. He proposed to Madame Besson to place her son at the *petit séminaire*, with a view to his training for the priesthood. The mother's heart shrank from the sacrifice, and she sent him instead to a school, where he imbibed many of the theories of the day, drifting farther and farther from the old royalist traditions of his early home, and unhappily from the sacred truths of the faith which in his mind were inseparably connected with them. Yet the grace of his Baptism and the sanctity of his first Communion were never desecrated by vice, nor the image of his mother, "the only woman he ever

loved," sullied by any lower affection or dimmed by the atmosphere of the seducing world of Paris. The light of faith was eclipsed indeed for a time, but it was living still, and ready to leap into a blaze, when the fog-damps around it should be dispelled by a fresh effusion of light from on high. From school Claude passed to the study of the art which was with him a passion, and we may almost say a religion; and with many of his companions in the same pursuit he became a disciple of M. Buchez, the leader of "the most Christian of all the socialist schools of the day." But the heart of Besson could find rest in nothing short of the truth of God. Wearied out with the search, he and some of his companions fell back on the lessons of their childhood. "A party was formed for the study of the Catechism;" and in the month of May, 1837, a deputation from the young republicans sought an interview with the venerable Curé of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, drawn thither, it may be, by the prayers of that marvellous confraternity.

More than twenty years afterwards (says M. Cartier), the venerable Abbé Désgenettes related to us under the shadow of the old trees in the garden of the Carnes, whither he had come to celebrate the Feast of S. Thomas of Aquin, his first interview with these young socialists, many of whom were then gathered round him in the white habit of S. Dominic. They wanted at first to lay down some conditions previous to their submission to the Church.

"M. L'Abbé," said their spokesman, "we all acknowledge the truth of Christianity, and we all desire to follow its precepts. But we must tell you first of all that we are Republicans, and that we desire to remain faithful to our principles." "My friends, that need not prevent you from being Christians; I hear the confessions of republicans, as well as of legitimists."—"What! you will not refuse us the Sacraments, though we are republicans?"—"Religion never asks to what political party men belong. She tolerates all opinions, and yours may be that a republic is the best form of government. Only if a disturbance should arise, and you come to consult me before you go out to the barricades, I may, perhaps, advise you to stay at home. Meanwhile, you can confess your sins, and receive Absolution."

The young men were charmed by this spirit of toleration, of which they had not believed a priest to be capable; and the good Curé of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, delighted with their uprightness and sincerity, conceived a particular affection for them, and soon overcame all their remaining prejudices.

Claude Besson had visited Rome before his conversion, but it was with far other feelings that he made a pilgrimage thither in the autumn of 1838. "He looked back with a feeling of remorse on those sanctuaries where he had not knelt, on the

dust of the martyrs, the holy and historic earth, which he had not venerated. It seemed to him that he was bound to make a pilgrimage to Rome to atone for the past, and to satisfy his faith as well as his love of art."

Six weeks of the following summer were spent at Assisi, at the shrine of the Saint of Poverty, to whom he had a special devotion, in the study of the works of Cimabue and Giotto. From this period dates his vocation to religion. He kept it concealed for a time; but his mother's anxious eye detected his secret, and, moved by the sight of her anguish, he gave her a promise never to leave her without her consent. In December, 1839, Père Lacordaire writes thus to one of his friends:—

"Besson is coming here early in March to make a copy of the *Madonna de la Quercia*, a miraculous image consecrated by more than three centuries of veneration. We have chosen her for our Patroness, and mean to carry the picture with us wherever we go, until the day when we shall be able to install it solemnly in our first French convent." When he had finished his work, the young artist knelt down at the feet of our B. Lady, and, laying his colours and brushes on her altar, he made a solemn vow never to touch them again, if only she would obtain for him his mother's permission to enter religion. The sacrifice was heroic; for, such was his intense devotion to his art, that he was wont to say that he could scarcely imagine the happiness of Heaven without it. His prayer was at last heard; he had returned to Rome for the Festival of Easter, and, notwithstanding his silence, his mother had guessed the wishes of his heart. One morning, after a last struggle with herself, she sought her son in his studio, and said, "My child, I know your wishes, and will no longer oppose them; I have but few years to live, and it will be happiness enough for me to see you happy."

Before Claude had time to reply, the door-bell rang, and P. Lacordaire came in from La Quercia to thank the young artist for his copy of the Madonna. Besson repeated to him the words just uttered by his mother, adding, "Father, will you have me?" Three days afterwards he was received at S. Sabina.

Perhaps the most interesting portion of M. Cartier's book is that which opens with the history of the Noviciate of the fervent little company of French Dominicans at S. Sabina and at Bosco, so full of the memories of S. Dominic and S. Pius. He traces with a sympathising (though, as it seems to us, a singularly impartial) hand, the struggles, the failures, and the triumphs of the work of restoration which they were called upon to direct.

In 1839, P. Lacordaire, by an heroic venture of faith, had left the admiring crowds which surrounded his pulpit at Notre Dame, to assume the proscribed habit of S. Dominic in the

Chapel of the Minerva, at Rome. Ten years afterwards, P. Jandel, one of his first companions, and, like P. Besson, a former disciple of the school of Buchez, was appointed by the Sovereign Pontiff Vicar-General of the Dominican Order. With a view to carrying out the reforms which the Holy Father had long been anxious to effect, P. Jandel immediately summoned P. Besson, his dearest and most trusted friend, from the direction of the house at Nancy, where the first noviciate had been formed in France, to aid him in his arduous and difficult task, by his singular gift of prudence and power of conciliation. During the time that he spent at Rome as Prior of S. Sabina, P. Besson resumed, under obedience, the practice of his beloved art, and began the series of frescos which now adorn the restored chapter-room of S. Sixtus. The work was one of especial interest to Pius IX., whose first visit to the new Fra Angelico is thus described:—

He chose, without giving notice of his intention, the Convent of S. Sixtus as the object of one of his daily drives. The entrance of the Holy Father's carriage and escort into the deserted court before the Chapter-room failed to distract the artist's attention from his work, and he had to descend from his scaffold, with his apron before him, and his palette and brushes in his hand, to receive Pius IX., who enjoyed his surprise, and made him tell him all his plans as to the restoration. He then conversed with him for some time upon France and the reform, ending with these memorable and characteristic words, "You Frenchmen are full of zeal; you are excellent for action, but you have not sufficient prudence. Rome has the gift of prudence because our Lord has endowed her with it. Do you see?—as a man, I am not worthy to grind your colours, or to serve you as a lay brother at S. Sixtus; but as Pope, I feel within myself that I have an enormous power. 'Sento in me un pezzo enorme;' " and then, turning towards the crucifix, 'It is not I who live, but Jesus Christ Who lives in me.' "

P. Besson was soon called away from this labour of love to sterner service befitting the great missionary name which he bore in religion. The peaceful labours of Fra Angelico were to give place to the hard conflicts of S. Hyacinthæ.

The Dominican mission at Mossul, near the site of the ancient Nineveh, which dates from the days of the holy founder himself, needed a hand of no common gentleness and firmness to save it from destruction.

The *Monachella* laid aside his colours, and went forth into the old regions of the East to restore the tarnished glory of the Catholic name by the sanctity of his example, and to win, by the sweetness of his charity, the hearts of the Chaldean Christians, who, though restored to Catholic unity, still bore the marks of their long-continued state of schism, and of the

degrading effects of Mussulman rule and Mussulman example. Here was a field wide enough for the enthusiastic philanthropy and ardent patriotism which the young socialist of former days had brought with him into the true home of all high and holy aspirations, and consecrated to God under the banner of S. Dominic. It had been the dream of his boyhood to see his country take the lead in spreading the doctrines of universal fraternity. The work of his manhood was to labour at her restoration to her true position, as the *eldest daughter of the Church*, and to work with her and for her in extending that true brotherhood, that celestial liberty, with which Christ alone can make us free, to all the nations within reach of her influence. By raising the tone of the Eastern Christians in Union with Rome he hoped to act upon the wide-spread communities still in separation, with whom they are united by the strong bond of a common origin and a common ritual.

P. Besson was recalled to Rome and S. Sixtus after two years of arduous and successful labours in the East. "He had increased," says his biographer, "the number of schools, and raised the tone of education; he had laid the foundation of a seminary for the Chaldean clergy, with whom he had established the most friendly relations, and installed four French religions, full of zeal and activity, under the enlightened direction of Mgr. Armanton, in the Dominican Convent of Mar-Yacoub, which he regarded as the centre of all the future triumphs of the Church in those regions."

P. Besson made a pilgrimage to the Holy Places in Palestine on his way back to Rome, where the severest trial to which his sensitive heart could have been exposed awaited him. During his absence a question had arisen concerning religious observance, on which the two men whom he most loved and revered on earth, P. Lacordaire and P. Jandel, were divided. His own convictions had been originally on the side of P. Jandel, by whom he was now sent into France to use his well-tryed judgment and patient charity in the settlement of the question. By careful investigation, and by long conference with P. Lacordaire, he came to the conviction that the first father of the reform had carried it as far as the present state of things rendered prudent or possible, and that the more perfect observance of the primitive rule desired by himself and P. Jandel ought not now to be enforced. By this sacrifice of his own long-cherished view he was the means of restoring peace to the Order, but at the sacrifice of his own. P. Jandel received him on his return to Rome with unabated affection, but the fear of having lost in some degree the confidence of his old friend and superior lay heavy at his heart, and was aggravated

by the knowledge that his conduct had been represented to the Holy Father as the result of a weak subservency to the overmastering will of P. Lacordaire. He returned with a heavy heart to his frescos at S. Sixtus, and worked hard to finish them with only one further desire—to end his days in some quiet cell in France. But new troubles had arisen in the mission at Mossul, and his heart responded to the earnest entreaties of the brethren there for his return. He obtained with some difficulty the consent of the Holy Father, who desired to keep him near his own person, and who gave him his parting blessing from his sick bed.

"The ave had just rung," writes his companion, Père Rouard de Card, "when we were brought into the Holy Father's room where he lay ill in bed. 'Here is P. Besson,' said his Holiness, 'who has set his heart upon going to the East. I should like to have kept him in the West, but what can be done? *Spiritus Dei ubi vult spirat.*'"

"We remained for half an hour with his Holiness, who was pleased to ask us various questions concerning the mission at Mossul, France, Belgium, and Holland, and to converse with us on the present position of the Church.

"'It seems to me,' said Pius IX., 'that our Lord says to me as He did to S. Peter, *Duc in altum*. Like him, I am on the wide sea, exposed to every wind and every storm, and, like him, I am tempted to cry, *Domine, salva nos, perimus*. But then it seems to me that our Lord reassures me, and bids me walk upon the waters. Poor S. Peter began to sink when he found himself on the water. If I had been in his place, I should, doubtless, have done the same. After all, what matters it, so long as my faith fails not?

"'If our Lord does not help His Vicar, whom will He help? *Et portæ inferni non prævalerunt adversus eam.*'"

The Holy Father finished the audience by this heartfelt benediction:—

"I bless the Dominicans of the mission of Mossul, of Belgium, and of Holland. I bless the whole order of S. Dominic. I bless the religious who are weak, that they may become strong; and those who are lukewarm, that they may become fervent. I bless those who are strong and fervent, that they may become stronger and more fervent still. I bless them all, that the Holy Spirit may perfect their hearts more and more in the unity of faith and charity."

Père Besson left Rome in 1859. Two years of unremitting and of (humanly speaking) unrequited labour followed his return to the mission which he had left so flourishing, and whither he had now returned to see his work neutralized by the factious intrigues of the Chaldean Patriarch and a party among the bishops and clergy. The history of this last trial



of his life, and of the unflinching courage and loyalty with which, uncheered and unsupported, he maintained the rights of Rome, while the misrepresentations of his enemies caused her to look coldly upon him, is full of painful interest and instruction. Well-nigh spent with the unequal struggle, he began once more to sigh for a cell in France, when a virulent typhus fever broke out at Mossul. This fearful scourge roused Père Besson from his depression, and seemed to revive his failing strength. He devoted himself with heroic charity to the care of the sick. At first he restricted his visits to the poor, leaving the rich to the care of the physicians; but all sent for him, and, unable to refuse his help to any one, he traversed the city from morning to night, bearing remedies and consolation to Catholics, schismatics, and Mussulmans. The houses which no one else dared to approach were his especial care; he sat for hours by the bedside of the dying, breathing the infected air of rooms crowded with the sick, and left them only when night obliged him to return to the convent. His life was consuming away unperceived by himself alone, so joyfully did he sacrifice himself for that Chaldæan Church which had inflicted so much suffering upon him.

Père Besson was struck down at last by the pestilence, and, after ten days of patient suffering, received the crown of a martyr of charity. One only brother in religion, one only priest of the Latin rite—Père Marie Augustin Rose—was at his dying bed, and he was too much exhausted by labour and sorrow to be able to officiate at his funeral. The office was chanted by Chaldæan monks around the lonely grave, where the missionary, says M. Cartier, "took possession of the land which he had laboured to convert." Over it has been erected a chapel to his patron Saint, "which stands like a beacon light to guide the sons of S. Dominic to follow in his path."

---



## ART. V.—IRISH WRITERS ON UNIVERSITY EDUCATION.

*University Education and Ultramontaniam.* By JOHN MACDEVITT, D.D.,  
Dean in the Catholic University of Ireland. Dublin: Kelly.

*University Education in Ireland.* A Letter to Sir John Acton, Bart., by  
WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN, Ph.D., Professor of Chemistry in the Catholic  
University of Ireland. Dublin: Kelly.

*Freedom of Education: What it means.* By JAMES LOWRY WHITTLE, A.B.,  
Trinity College, Dublin. Dublin: Hodges & Co.

*A Letter to the "Daily News"* of March 29, 1866, signed J. D'Arcy, A.B.,  
Trinity College, Dublin.

WE have no intention at this moment of entering on the general question of Irish University Education. It is not till the episcopal negotiations with Government have been brought to a satisfactory termination, and the new system is finally determined, that the time will have arrived to consider its various bearings on the spiritual interest of Ireland. At present we shall but make a few miscellaneous observations, on the various brochures named at the head of our article. Nor should we probably have done so much as this, had it not been for the comments made on this REVIEW in three of their number.

Of those who most cordially approve the general principles which we advocate, none (we imagine) have ever examined our pages one-half so carefully and exhaustively, as Mr. Whittle has done with the view of *protesting* against those principles. Our articles, our notices of books, our record of foreign events, have all been diligently ransacked by that most diligent and unwearied gentleman, for every thing which may enable him the better to frighten Englishmen with the bugbear of "Ultramontaniam." Dr. Sullivan in his reply cites Bishop Clifford's straightforward remark, that "the views which we advocate are worth just as much as the arguments with which we support them, and no more. If the subjects we treat," adds his Lordship, "are open questions, they remain open subjects after they have been treated just as much as they did before" (p. 49, note). If, indeed, we were to express any regret at the Bishop having so spoken, it would only be because his words might be (without his intention) understood by some as implying, that we had put forth some greater

claim of authority than he here concedes; but our readers are well aware how far this is from being the case. We may expand the Bishop of Clifton's language somewhat as follows. There are various open questions in the Catholic Church, on which we have as much right to our opinion as Mr. Whittle has to his; and on which we have argued to the best of our ability for one particular side. Such, *e. g.*, before Rome and the English Bishops had authoritatively spoken, was the question of a Catholic college at Oxford. On all such matters the views which we humbly advocate "are worth just as much as the arguments by which we support them, and no more." There are other questions, which Mr. Whittle indeed may *consider* open, but in regard to which we maintain that the Church has infallibly pronounced. Should any Catholic contravene *her* teaching on any subject whatever,—and should he not have the plea of invincible ignorance,—he would commit a grave offence; not of course (how unspeakably preposterous a notion!) because he differs from the DUBLIN REVIEW, but because he is rebellious to the Church's voice.

We will illustrate his statement from a topic, which is mentioned by Dr. Sullivan in connection with this REVIEW. Nothing can be more Christian than this distinguished philosopher's whole tone and temper; and we tender him our best thanks, for the courtesy with which he has throughout treated a publication from which it is evident he so decidedly dissents. We are further particularly glad to observe his language in pp. 60, 61. For he seems plainly there to imply, that he considers the "*Mirari vos*" and the "*Quantà curâ*"—whether or no as strictly infallible—at all events as possessing a legitimate claim over the Catholic's interior conviction. And certainly the notion is extravagant, that a Catholic university or college could tolerate any tenet, which has been condemned in either of these two Encyclicals. But Dr. Sullivan (p. 61) understands the "*Mirari vos*" as referring not to "political," but to "religious" toleration; in other words, as proscribing indeed the tenet of indifferentism, but as in no respect pronouncing on the *civil* toleration of religious error. We are amazed that so able a man and so dispassionate a thinker can have acquiesced in a view, which is absolutely irreconcilable with the Pope's express words. We urged this in January, 1865 (pp. 59, 60), and we intreat Dr. Sullivan's attention to the argument which we there drew out. He proceeds indeed (p. 63) to add a certain qualification. "If a community," he says, "profess but one form of religion, I can understand the State pleading the inexpediency of permitting the introduction of opinions which, under cover of

religious propagandism, may originate *political and social disturbances*." But we cannot admit that he thus succeeds in bringing himself into harmony with the Church. Every reader will understand the above passage as implying, that the civil power has no right of repressing religious error with a view to the people's *religious interest*, but only with a view to the prevention of *political and social disturbances*. Now Pius IX., in his "*Quantâ curâ*," expressly denounces a certain tenet, as contrary to "the doctrine of Scripture, of the Church, and of the holy Fathers." What is that tenet? That "that is the best condition of society, in which no *duty* is recognized as attached to the civil power of restraining by enacted penalties offenders against the Catholic religion, except so far as public peace may require." The Pope, you see, sharply *censures* any notion, that "offenders against the Catholic religion" may not be punished as such by the civil power, except so far as may be requisite for the public peace; *i.e.*, for the prevention of "political and social disturbances."

Has the Pope then, as Mr. Whittle seems to think, proscribed all civil toleration of religious error, as being in itself unlawful? On the contrary, Perrone points out (quoted by Dr. Sullivan p. 63, note) that under certain circumstances such toleration is "not lawful only, but even necessary." On two previous occasions (to speak of no other) we have argued that neither Papal Encyclical is in the slightest degree inconsistent with this opinion. (See Jan., 1865, pp. 62-68; and April, 1865, pp. 487-492.) We cannot express our reasoning more briefly than it is there stated; and we can only therefore refer Mr. Whittle to the passages themselves. He is, of course, thoroughly well acquainted with them; as he is with every proposition, great or small, which has been put forth in the new series of this *REVIEW*: and we think, therefore, he would have acted more fairly, if among his other extracts he had introduced the following:—

We are very far from being of the number of those who blindly admire everything mediæval, and disparage everything modern; on the contrary, we think that the Catholics of this day have many inestimable advantages denied to their forefathers. But we must ever contend that the relation between Church and State which existed theoretically in the middle ages, is the one normal relation; and that had the Church been enabled to continue her work of civilization under the same conditions, the superiority of modern times would not be (as it is) very questionable, but would have been incontestable and most signal. And just as the civil power in these islands would act rightly and laudably in repressing all attempt at the introduction of polygamistic or atheistic error, so in those days was it the sacred duty and high privilege of a Catholic monarch to

repress all heretical inroads on Catholic peace and unity. So much material force was, at all events, legitimate, as might suffice for the purpose of repression; and, in estimating the degree of this force, one circumstance should never be forgotten, which, on the contrary, seems never remembered. It is the very idea of punishment, that he who undergoes it shall be in a far more painful condition than others are. At a time, therefore, when the ordinary condition of humanity was that of severe and continuous suffering, it was an absolute necessity that punishment for every kind of offence should wear an aspect of pitilessness and sternness, which very naturally appals the modern "gentlemen of England who live at home at ease."

But so soon as the unity of Christendom was really at an end, and Protestantism took permanent root in Europe, the whole policy of repression needed to be reconsidered. And passing to the present day, let us suppose *Catholics to be ever so predominant in numbers throughout a given country*, so long as there exists in that country even one hereditary Protestant sect, we have no hesitation in affirming these three propositions:—(1) Catholics are not required by the "*Mirari vos*," or by any other authoritative teaching, to withhold from that sect full "religious liberty." (2) *They would act most unwisely and (in fact) unjustly by attempting to withhold it.* Nor (3) would the Popes urge them in an opposite direction. We admit that in such a state of things a certain civil pre-eminence ought to be given to the Church, analogous in some respects to that enjoyed in England by the state religion. We mean, that it ought to be the one recognized national religion, enjoying such privileges as are implied in that condition; privileges, however, which would be perfectly compatible with the most complete toleration of other Christian denominations. *Certainly, then, we make no unreasonable demand here in England, when we claim that liberty from our Protestant countrymen, which they would most assuredly receive from us were circumstances reversed.* And the case becomes even stronger when we consider that if (as is reasonable) those only should be regarded as constituting one religious body who agree with each other on what they consider essential, it is doubtful whether any single religious body in England is larger than our own. We have spoken of England: as applied to Ireland, of course, the whole argument becomes indefinitely more powerful, as in that country the State Church cannot lay any colourable claim to being the Church of the nation (Jan., 1865, pp. 65-6).

We implied at starting that this topic affords a good illustration of those instances, in which we have spoken with a certain peremptoriness, which we are as far as possible from regretting or disavowing. We have never to this moment seen the slightest attempt fairly to confront the "*Mirari vos*" and the "*Quantâ curâ*," and to explain their phraseology otherwise than as condemning in principle the liberty of worships and of the press. The Church, we say, fully permits any Catholic to hold that, under the particular circumstances of this or that particular country,—as for instance where Protestant

sects have an hereditary existence—such liberty is a far less evil than any practicable alternative; but she does *not* permit him to hold that it is in itself good. We cannot then consider *this* an open question.\* We hold it an obvious duty to speak with much severity—not, indeed, of *individuals* who may have indefinite excuse for misconception—but of those Catholics as a *school*, as a *class*, who refuse submission to the Church's plain and indubitable teaching on the subject. Dr. Sullivan indeed cites the Bishop of Orleans (p. 61) as interpreting differently the "*Quantâ curâ*": but there is no ground whatever for such a statement; as will be evident to any one, who carefully studies that prelate's celebrated pamphlet.

In a similar spirit we would comment on Dr. Sullivan's implication at starting (pp. 1, 2), that he is opposed to the principles advocated in this Review, because he is one of those "who believe that it is possible to combine a sincere attachment to the doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church, with the fullest and freest cultivation of all human science, and the honest adoption of the political principles of free nations." Now first as to the latter part of this sentence. We are not aware of any Catholics on the face of the globe, who consider themselves precluded by their religion from "the honest adoption of the political principles of free nations;" so long as they refrain from regarding liberty of worship and of the press as positive blessings, and so long as they renounce one or two other kindred errors which the Church has also condemned. But as to the former part of the clause, we desiderate fuller light. The Holy Father has ruled in the Munich Brief that "the Catholic cultivators of natural science must have [ever] before their eyes *divine revelation as their guiding star*: under the light of which they may be protected against quicksands and errors; where in their investigations and arguments they may perceive that they may be led thereby (*as is very often the case*) to put forth matter more or less opposed to the infallible truth of those things which have been revealed by God." Moreover we would remind our readers, that the Catholic Episcopate throughout the world has accepted, not only the Munich Brief itself, but also the "*Quantâ curâ*," which testifies to that Brief as authoritative. When Dr. Sullivan, then, speaks of "the fullest and freest cultivation of all human science," we shall be glad to know whether he does or does not claim, for such

---

\* It has sometimes been suggested that it is at all events imprudent to bring before *public attention* the Church's teaching on this head. We would entreat our reader to look at some remarks in our last number (p. 445-7) in reply to such a suggestion.

science, a greater liberty than the Pope has conceded to it. If he do *not* claim a greater liberty for it, we can see no difference in this respect between his principles and our own. But if he *does*, his opinion is *not* consistent with "a sincere attachment to the doctrines of the Catholic Church," because it directly contradicts one of them. We may add also—which he himself will be the first to admit—that the doctrine (if really taught by the Church) is of most vital and unspeakable importance, in the present aspect of the philosophical world.

Mr. D'Arcy writes from Trinity College, Dublin, in opposition to his fellow-collegian, Mr. Whittle; but his language towards this REVIEW is by no means so courteous as Dr. Sullivan's. He considers that we "foist" our speculations "on the public as the infallible pronouncements of Catholic opinion;" and that we "ought to be treated with the neglect, if not contempt, which we deserve." We challenge him to produce one single instance, in which we have put forth our articles as "pronouncements" of any opinion on earth except our own; still less, "infallible" pronouncements: and we willingly concede to him, that had we done so we should deserve contempt. What the writers in this REVIEW may think, matters extremely little to any one; but what the Pope and Catholic Episcopate may *teach*, is a somewhat different affair. According to Mr. D'Arcy, it is because the writers of this REVIEW are chiefly Oxford converts, that we "preach down," as he expresses it, "liberty of the press and toleration of religious dissent." It so happens that the majority of our writers are neither Oxford converts nor converts at all. But apart from this, is the Pope, then, an Oxford convert? Are the Catholic bishops throughout the world—are the writers in the "*Civiltà*" and the "*Monde*"—Oxford converts? Have *these* men "all the zeal, all the credulity, all the intolerance of neophytes?" How can Mr. D'Arcy bring himself to write so foolishly and absurdly?

Mr. D'Arcy is specially unfair in one extract. He says that we "hold most strange language," because we consider it to have been mischievous, that at a certain period Galileo and others seemed to regard Copernicanism as really true. Our distinct argument was, that at that period the Copernican theory was mainly rested by Galileo on grounds scientifically fallacious; and that scientific probability was then all on the other side. An Ultramontane writer must of course always be in the wrong. But if Dr. Sullivan, *e.g.*, had made the obvious remark, that it is mischievous to regard a theory as scientifically proved at a time when it is actually opposed to scientific probability, Mr. D'Arcy would have been liberal in his assent and applause.



At last, however, it is better to point out what Dr. M'Devitt has implied; viz., that this REVIEW, notwithstanding its name, has no special connection with Ireland. Of course any Catholic periodical, published in these kingdoms, should pay careful attention to Irish matters, because Ireland is the only Catholic one of the three. But the DUBLIN REVIEW is no more an Irish publication, than the "Edinburgh Review" is a Scotch. A Review, called the "Edinburgh," is published in London by Longman; and another, called the "Dublin," is published in London by Burns. Accordingly our theological censors are responsible to the Archbishop, not of Dublin, but of Westminster. Neither Archbishop Cullen nor any other Irish Bishop is more responsible for whatever may appear in our pages, than for what may appear in the "Monde" or the "Correspondant."

From the mention of one Quarterly we pass to that of another. We observe with great pleasure, that Dr. Sullivan has inserted copious extracts from an admirable article on Irish University Education, which appeared in the "Home and Foreign Review" for January, 1863. We are delighted that he is in agreement with it; for it is to our mind conspicuous, not more for its great ability, than for the remarkable soundness and religiousness of its principles. The former qualification was very far oftener found in the pages of that periodical than the latter; but this article unites both in an unusual degree. Dr. Sullivan, however, almost seems to imply that this particular article, in tone, temper, and opinion, is a fair representative of the Review in which it appeared. If he does mean this, we must express our own earnest dissent from such a judgment, but have no wish to pursue the discussion.

The following admirable passage is one of those extracted by Dr. Sullivan from this article:—

It would require too large a space to carry out an enquiry as to the character of the education which is given in these institutions, even to those who complete their university course; it is enough to say, that modern history is not taught, and that if it were, the religious sense of some of the pupils would infallibly be offended. Catholic youths could not be required to listen to Protestant versions of that period,

"When love first taught a monarch to be wise,  
And gospel truth looked forth from Boleyn's eyes;"

and the witness which history, impartially investigated, bears to the position and prerogatives of the Holy See could not be listened to by Protestant



students without danger to some of their religious opinions. Some attempt, we believe, is made to teach moral philosophy. We do not envy the professor who approaches the sciences which have reference to freedom of the will, the law of duty, and the other subjects treated of by Locke, Clarke, Reid, Cousin, and those other philosophers to whose works reference is made in the examination-questions at the several Queen's Colleges, with a sincere desire to avoid everything that can be offensive either to Protestant or to Catholic ears. In point of fact, the examination-papers appended to the reports of the presidents of the colleges show that even controversial questions are not avoided. We give a single example: "Wherein did Anthony Collins and Jonathan Edwards agree, and wherein did they differ, as to freedom of the will?" Are the works of Jonathan Edwards suitable reading for Catholic students? They are pre-eminently controversial; and their end and object is to teach ultra-Calvinism. In one word, *moral philosophy and metaphysics cannot be properly taught in mixed colleges, any more than history and theology*. To abstract these sciences from education is to go against the authority of all ages, against the practice of all countries, and to take away the best and most effectual means of developing the intellectual faculties and forming the mind of youth. "*Infelix operis summâ, quia ponere totum nesciet,*" is the motto which ought to be placed over the gates of the Queen's Colleges.

And his own remarks to the same effect are no less striking and important.

Neither can there be a Catholic or Protestant *logic, metaphysics, ethics, philosophic history, or political economy*; for the rational sciences are, all alike, the inseparable inheritance of human reason, wherever it is to be found, as truth itself is one and indivisible. But these sciences have this special characteristic, that, unlike the physical sciences, they do not induce from the phenomena of sensible experience, but deduce from premises of a wholly different order, and *concerning which any amount of plausible error may happen to be assumed*. For this reason, precisely, the authorities of the Catholic Church were desirous of having such subjects taught to Catholics by persons in whose opinions they could have confidence, and *whose knowledge of Catholic doctrines they considered sound*. So long as any one admits the principle of a Church, *he must admit the reasonableness of this demand*. The opponent of all Churches, and the advocate of emancipation from all religious authority, does not, of course, admit such a right on the part of any clergy; but he must admit the right of persons to hold any opinion they choose, and to educate their children as they think fit. To substitute the opinion of the State, which is the opinion of a certain number, for that of the parent, would be tyranny, and worse than any spiritual tyranny. If Catholics, then, choose to admit the right of the clergy to have an influence upon the mode of teaching those subjects *which are intimately associated with, nay, perfectly inseparable from, religious dogma*, they are perfectly entitled to do so (pp. 24, 5).

Dr. Sullivan then frankly admits that "logic, metaphysics,

ethics, philosophical history, political economy," are all "intimately associated with, nay perfectly inseparable from, religious dogma." It is plain that if all these subjects are absolutely inseparable from dogma, ecclesiastical authority is of right no less simply supreme in deciding how they shall be taught to Catholics, than in deciding what theological course shall be given to clerical students. Yet we find Dr. Sullivan, immediately after the previous extract, saying (p. 25), that "the Irish bishops and clergy" have "overstepped the limits of their own province." But how can this be so, even on his own showing? It is their exclusive function to preserve from injury the Deposit of Faith; and Dr. Sullivan admits that the Deposit of Faith is not more injured by false teaching on theology itself, than by false teaching on "logic, metaphysics, ethics, philosophical history, and political economy." But, in fact, it is even *more* vitally injured by the latter than by the former; because the evil is so incomparably more subtle, and more difficult therefore of detection and denunciation.

Here, then, we part company with Dr. Sullivan. All our readers are well aware of his great eminence in the cultivation of physical science; but his present pamphlet will show them that his intellectual power extends over a far wider range. The work is characterized throughout by great ability and thoughtfulness; and we would particularly recommend to attention its comments, on the different manifestations of public opinion in Catholic Ireland, and on the weight respectively due to them. His narrative of facts also is extremely complete and valuable; and some gross mistakes of Mr. Whittle's are put right. "*Talis cùm sit, utinam noster esset.*" Dr. Sullivan writes in so Christian a spirit, with such largeness of view, such unflagging power, and such full information, that it is very painful to be reminded from time to time, by some harsh and jarring expression, that he is not one of those who yield that absolutely unreserved assent to the Church's whole body of teaching, which we claim as her due.

Dr. M'Devitt's is, in fact, the only one of the three pamphlets, with which we can express unreserved sympathy and agreement. It meets Mr. Whittle's arguments and assertions one by one, and signally overthrows that shallow and pretentious writer. The following extract both is in itself important, and also affords an excellent specimen of our author's mode of doing business.

Thus his argument rests entirely on a fact, and will of course stand or fall with it: viz., that the Catholic bishops and those who have acted with them

in their efforts towards the establishment of the Catholic University hold the doctrine which Mr. Whittle calls "Ultramontaniam," and that this doctrine is the principle, the beginning, and the end, of their action in the matter. If, then, this "Ultramontaniam," which he has described as a fact, is, in truth, a fiction, his entire argument breaks down.

Mr. Whittle makes an assertion, definite, clear, distinct. He asserts with much emphasis the existence of a public fact here in our own country, Ireland, in our own time, and under our own eyes. He describes for us with abundant fulness a doctrine, or "set of principles," which he calls "Ultramontaniam," and which he tells us is the creed and principle of what he terms the "Ultramontane" party—a party which is a formidable power in this country. He gives the names of the leading "Ultramontanes" in Ireland; they are the Irish Catholic bishops, and such members of Parliament as have their support at elections, and such gentlemen of the press as they are able to influence.

It is, then, fortunate that we have not to go up to the skies or to cross the seas to look for a test of the truth of this statement. For as the bishops and the members of parliament and the gentlemen of the press are all well known to the public, Mr. Whittle has had no better opportunities of knowing their principles than any other man in the country who has been a careful observer of passing events. Now we have failed to see any reason for saying, that these gentlemen have been what he describes as "Ultramontanes." He is bound to prove his assertion. The plain way by which he could show that he has represented their opinions truly, would be to get from each of them an affirmative answer to the following queries, which contain the principles he has ascribed to them. *I take them word for word from his pamphlet.*

1. Do you hold "that the Church is the heaven-appointed ruler of the earth and all it contains"?
2. Do you hold that "what men call law, liberty, philosophy, are but the creatures of their own licentious imaginations"?
3. Do you "regard human reason as the great *ignis fatuus* of man," and that "freedom of thought, freedom of action, were new and terrible inventions"?
4. Do you "profess antagonism to our whole social system"?
5. Do you teach our unhappy people "that there is no safety for their souls but in keeping everything English at a distance"?
6. Do you hold that "were it possible to extirpate Protestants or independent Catholics here by extreme measures, the Church would be bound to proceed, if necessary, to the persecutions of the Inquisition"?
7. Do you think it right and proper, when useful for the cause of Ultramontaniam, to "mutilate or interpolate" authors? and to have recourse to an "ingenious falsification of history"?

Is our author willing to take their answers to these questions as the true verdict on his assertion? If he is, I shall gladly abide by the decision. But if he will stick to his statement, in spite of anything these gentlemen themselves may say to the contrary, he is bound to produce clear and decisive evidence of the truth of his assertion, otherwise he is open to a condemnation

from every man of honour more severe than anything I will say of him (pp. 11-13).

In regard to the question itself of the arrangement contemplated by the Irish Episcopate and the English Government—as between Catholic and Catholic, we can well understand there being two opinions on its advisableness; but, as between Catholic and Protestant, the objections raised against it (we can use no milder word) are simply shameless.

When we say that, as between Catholic and Catholic, two opinions are possible, we mean this. The present scheme is avowedly a compromise. The Irish bishops have abandoned what they think a higher ideal—viz., a chartered Catholic University—for what, under present circumstances, they hold to be more attainable, or more desirable, or both. Considering that they act in fullest communication with Rome—and considering also the various conditions of the problem—we quite believe that in this they judge correctly. Still it is imaginable that a good Catholic may think otherwise; though, of course, now that the bishops have determined their course, he would not dream of publicly obtruding an opposite opinion.

All this is intelligible enough. But what amazes and disgusts us, is the opposition with which certain liberals have encountered the proposal; nay, and on the very ground of their liberal principles. Nothing can be clearer than Dr. M'Devitt's arguments, or more simply unanswerable.

In the case of Ireland the population is divided into two great and distinct bodies, Catholics and non-Catholics, the Catholics being an immense majority. Among both classes there are some who have no objection to go for their education to institutions established on the mixed principle; but *the great bulk of the nation have a decided objection to this system.* Thus the most important section of the non-Catholic body, and *almost the whole of the Catholic body,* have always shown a partiality for the denominational system. The statesman may regret that there is not a wider preference for the mixed system, still he cannot but take the fact as he finds it. Now the Legislature has determined that such a provision shall be made for first-class education, as will meet the wants of the entire body of the Irish nation. And as the systems are made for the people, and not the people for the systems, is it to be wondered at if a statesman should think it better, on the whole, to give them the institutions for which they have so decided a preference? Then those Irishmen, of whatever class, who elect the mixed system, have already ample provision in the Queen's Colleges, while those of the Established Church, who prefer the denominational system, have in Trinity College a richly endowed denominational University. *The great Catholic body, who have the deepest repugnance to mixed institutions, ask for their Catholic Uni-*

versity the power of granting degrees.\* One would suppose there is nothing "extravagantly insolent" in this demand, or anything opposed to the principles of free and enlightened government. The worst that any man, even the warmest admirer of the mixed system, can reasonably say of the Catholic body, is, that they share a certain preference with the Protestant public of Great Britain. And yet the mere hope that so cheap a privilege may be accorded to the Catholic people of Ireland, "has excited surprise and alarm" (pp. 4-5).

In the course of the spring a deputation of liberals waited on Lord Russell in behalf of their view. We remember the general purport of the conversation which ensued; but we have not been at the pains to look back at its record. Rather we have thought it well to draw out an imaginary scene, "founded," indeed, "on facts," but embellished to exhibit more clearly the point at issue.

*Deputation.* We have called on you, my Lord, in reference to Irish University Education, for the purpose of appealing to you in the name of liberal principles.

*Lord Russell.* I am glad to gather from your words that you have called to withdraw all further opposition to the Government plan.

*D.* On the contrary, it is against that plan that we protest in the name of liberal principles.

*Lord R.* You protest, then, in the name of liberal principles, against the carrying out of liberal principles?

*D.* It is not the carrying out of liberal principles but of their contradictories, to sanction an educational body, which does not open its door except to one particular denomination.

*Lord R.* What then do you mean by liberal principles?

*D.* The principle that no man shall be placed under temporal disadvantage for his religious opinions.

*Lord R.* I so fully agree with your principle, that it has induced me to promote the measure which you oppose.

*D.* Exclusive education, supported on liberal principles!

*Lord R.* Precisely. I ask you this plain question. Is it or is it not a religious opinion—and one prevalent among vast numbers both of Englishmen and Irishmen—that mixed education inflicts on their children a most serious calamity; and that no system is tolerable except the denominational?

*D.* We believe there are vast numbers so illiberal as to hold this opinion.

---

\* Or rather now, only the attainableness of degrees by its members as such. —(Ed. *Dublin Review*.)

*Lord R.* Here then is a certain religious opinion. Liberal principles then require that those who hold it shall not be subjected—in consequence of holding it—to any temporal disadvantage.

*D.* Certainly. We have no wish to inflict on them any temporal disadvantage, for holding it as strongly, and proclaiming it as loudly, as they please. Liberalism forbid!

*Lord R.* Well, but tell me. Suppose that a Methodist *e.g.* were allowed indeed, without molestation, to hold and proclaim that Methodism is true; but that he were placed under serious temporal disadvantage, so soon as he began to frequent a Methodist chapel. Could such a procedure be defended on liberal principles?

*D.* Of course not.

*Lord R.* Or suppose a Roman Catholic were allowed indeed, without molestation, to hold and proclaim that the Host is the very Body of Christ; but that he were placed under serious temporal disadvantage, if he fell down in adoration before that Host. Could *such* a procedure be defended on liberal principles?

*D.* No more than the former.

*Lord R.* Liberal principles then require that men shall be permitted, without incurring temporal disadvantage, not merely to hold and disseminate those religious opinions which they honestly entertain, but also to act on those opinions; to put them in practice.

*D.* That is so, no doubt.

*Lord R.* Let us go back then to the particular religious opinion before us, "Mixed education inflicts on children a most serious calamity, and the denominational system is alone tolerable." Those who honestly hold this opinion do not (you will admit) enjoy religious liberty, if they are placed under temporal disadvantage by putting it into practice.

*D.* We cannot but admit this.

*Lord R.* Now will you explain to me how this opinion can be put into practice? A Methodist as such puts *his* religious opinion into practice by frequenting a Methodist chapel; a Roman Catholic as such puts *his* religious opinion into practice by adoring the Host. But how can he who disapproves mixed education put *that* religious opinion into practice?

*D.* We can see no other way of his doing so, except sending his children to a denominational system.

*Lord R.* It is required then by liberal principles, that he shall not be placed under temporal disadvantage by so doing?

*D.* Certainly.



*Lord R.* But is not the circumstance of his children being unable to attain *degrees*, a most serious disadvantage to him?

*D.* In many cases, no doubt.

*Lord R.* It is required then by liberal principles, that every man, who honestly thinks a denominational system of education the only tolerable one, may send his children to such a system, without incurring the consequence of their being unable to attain degrees. In the name of liberal principles you have appealed to me against a measure which those principles imperatively demand. I am engaged in the great work of my life, the carrying out of liberalism; and in the name of liberalism you warn me to forbear. One thing you show very plainly; viz., that you have no real notion of what is meant by the very principles which you clamorously profess. "*Solventur risu tabulæ; tu missus abibis.*" Or rather "*vos missi abibitis.*"

So the members of the deputation "depart" looking extremely small.

---

#### ART. VI.—INTERESTS OF THE CATHOLIC POOR.

*Association of the Sacred Heart for the Education of the Children of the Poor in London.* Signed, HENRY EDWARD, Archbishop of Westminster.

*Westminster Diocesan Fund.* Signed, HENRY EDWARD, Archbishop of Westminster.

ONE characteristic of our day must strike every man who combines a study of history with observation of the present: we mean, the rise and development of what is technically known as "Social Science." This may be defined, sufficiently for our present purpose, as the application of modern experiment, discovery, and general social progress, to improve the condition of the humbler classes. We say the *humbler* classes, to distinguish it from the mere development of that spirit of luxury, which in the sphere of the "upper ten thousand" is always holding out a prize, like the Roman tyrant of old, to him who shall invent a new pleasure. With such a perverted application of human ingenuity and toil we have, of course, less than no sympathy. We do not refer to it, except by accident or contrast, in speaking of Social Science. Nay, we must regard such over-polishing and adornment of the mere surface of life with grave disapproval,



even with grave anxiety. Bad in itself, it is the forerunner of worse. Not the Catholic moralist or essayist alone, but the general philanthropist, nay, the general observer, must see in the spread and intensity of the "Social Science" of luxurious living a moral and political evil. It is morally evil, for it enervates the character of the individual: hence, too, it becomes politically evil, as it deprives the State of her master-workmen, and weakens the corporate life of the whole. Luxury, and the development of the arts of luxury, can hardly consist with vigorous thinking, with the self-denials of genuine patriotism, with the toil of brain, unflagging effort, steadfast aim and will, by which man has ever wrought out great results for his brother man. It hardly consists with the tempered domestic enjoyments and cheerfully accepted duties of family life, which reproduces in unnumbered homes the miniature of a great ideal of the patriarchal Government and State, precious in the eyes alike of ethics and of political economy. In proportion as the men of a state decline from the old simple, grave, and self-denying public life, which in Pagan times was a rude foreshadowing of the Christian polity, and in Christian times was the type of mind and of man produced by the Church: when

Privatus illis census erat brevis,  
Commune magnum;

when great things were done, great offerings made, for the body politic, out of the staid and generous economy of the individual—in the same proportion has that state too surely entered upon the period of decline. It may be passing through a splendid vestibule, a gorgeous banquetting-hall; but that passage leads out to the scaffold. Be it the age of Augustus; and through a vista of years we see the northern barbarian at the gates of famished Rome. Be it the age of Louis XIV.; a glance forward shows us the rabble of Paris drunken and maddened with the blood of their ancient kings. The throne-room of the *Grand Monarque* melts, as by a dissolving view, into a picture of that altar of Nemesis, the Nemesis of the spurned and neglected poor—the Guillotine.

In pursuance of this train of thought, let it be permitted to us to sketch a character. The name shall be of the past; but the character is of all times. London will do for the background of our portrait as well as ancient Athens; and he has spoken in Westminster quite as probably as from the Pnyx. Alcibiades, then, stands before us, type of the handsome and not ungifted loungeur of heathen refinement; a being not without talents, not without bravery; a man of *virtù* though not

of public or private virtue; a *dilettante* and a dabbler in many things he does not carry through, and who can talk brilliantly with Socrates himself; a disjointed mechanism of mere possible forces, without a main-spring, without a motive power beyond the moment: who has never worked consistently since he began to be, nor ever will, while the world endures. We need not go back into a chapter of history to say this: for Alcibiades, or some one very like him, perhaps with less talent, with not more dashing courage, not more listless good nature and *laissez faire*, is at this moment polishing the flagstones of Pall Mall with his boots, or yawning in the bow-window of his club in St. James' Street, or making up his books for the next Derby; or, in some brilliant saloon, displaying a wit that outshines the ἀνήριθμον γέλασμα of the diamonds, sparkle they never so enchantingly beneath the blaze of those hundred-lighted chandeliers. Contemplate him under any of these phases of his existence; speculate *à priori*, before the Great Book shall contain the history of the actual irrecoverable deeds of the life that he is throwing away. What will he effect, what will he store up in any garner, during the energetic portion of his three-score years and ten? He may lead a dashing charge of the 10th Hussars at some Waterloo or Balaklava; for he has the energy of a lion during a full quarter of an hour, till sloth, like the father-in-law in the fable, comes to draw again his teeth and claws. He may take up his pen for about the same space of time; and the very effeminacy of his habitual thoughts, and the practice of an ear attuned to the cadences of articulate music, shall give a softness to his syllables and teach his numbers a flow, to make us look at him twice, in doubt whether it is the Laureate we hear. He is singing some "airy, fairy Lillian," or achieving a stanza of some dreamy "Lotos-eaters." We cannot stay to draw him full-length. *Ex pede Herculem*. Here is a human instep, encased in a boot of Hoby's best; whence (if you, gentle reader, are a Cuvier in comparative anatomy) you may construct the life size Alcibiades of Belgravia, the votary and disciple, not professor—he give lectures! of the Social Science of our privileged classes.

*Vanitas vanitatum, et omnia vanitas*, this "strenuous indolence" and emptiness of all result, in Vanity Fair!

We must plead guilty to a grievous digression from the thought we started with, into which we ought by this time to have made some way. The Social Science we are now to say a few words about, is the science that aims at benefiting the sons and daughters of toil, hard-handed mechanics, grimy coalheavers, wan sempstresses, and the yet more squalid and

miserable classes below them again. It develops a blessed instinct that enables man, in ease or independence, to care for his fellow-man, overtaken, outworn, underfed, and not taught at all. It enables him to look on that brother by faith, not by sight, and efficaciously to resolve, at the cost of whatever physical or moral repugnance, to do him a benefit. It leads its disciples into the haunts of squalor and fetid misery, into the hotbeds of contagion, and rookeries of abject want; if not into the very dens of crime, at least into the solitary cell by which society punishes that crime. It breaks through the barricades which custom had built up, impervious as a castle-wall, between the several classes. It bridges over those increasing divergencies whereby excessive wealth and extreme penury, an over-fastidious refinement and the repulsive coarseness of misery, hopeless, ignorant, brutalized, and abandoned, conspired in an ever-widening breach, to a mutually disastrous result. And thus, by tending to provide better subjects as the *material* for legislation and government, Social Science has made itself a powerful auxiliary, and an acknowledged benefactor, in the cause of public order, public safety, and national greatness. If such results are larger than what fell within its primary scope, they are not the less real or important. And it has effected them even more by its moral than by its mechanical appliances; by awakening among influential members and sections of the community a hearty fervour and well-directed energy of benevolence, for which legislation and Government cannot be too grateful, since no legislation is competent to enact and no government to enforce them.

From all this, two consequences are plain; one, that social science is either a synonym for, or a human imitation of, that organized system of charity which sprang up with the Church, and is ever inherent in the Church. The other, that the condition of the science itself in any given state or kingdom, the degree of its advancement or decline, its cultivation or its neglect, may be taken as a gage of the religious life and national healthfulness existing there. Of these two propositions, the second concerns us now: with the first, we hope to deal in some future number.

See, then, how it was at the fatal change of religion in England three hundred years ago. The social science of the day was real, and sound, and not unsystematic, though not gaged or tabulated by human systems. Social science was the unknown name for a well-known thing. It meant Catholic charity, and it went out with Catholicity. More's *Utopia* sounded almost the last note of Catholic literature in England, before the devastating convulsion that rent the

nation from the centre of unity, and so from the source of charity. And from the publication of that beautiful dream of Christian polity, on through the dark three centuries of religious coldness that succeeded, the topics with which Social Science deals became more and more obscured and forgotten. Nor was this to be wondered at. A new system, a new theory, was inaugurated with what was complacently termed "the new learning." The spoliation of the monasteries repeated in the Schedule A. and Schedule B. of Henry VIII.'s godless "reform," was the great disinheritance of the poor. Not only they who had renounced all for our Lord's sake and His gospel's were expelled from their poor cells, and mulcted of the spare meal in their common hall, evicted and turned out on the bleak world they had renounced in the fulness of their strength, and with all the force of their will. Not only the vested interests of a lawful adoption into communities and a blameless usufruct of the rights of the monastic life were disregarded. The cruelty, the injustice, went further. It drove also the *involuntary* poor from the desecrated gate of the cloister. The dole of temporal assistance for which poverty of the inferior order waited at the threshold of poverty elevated and consecrated, was snatched from the hand of the dispensing monk or friar, but not in order to feed the secular mendicant. It was a simple diversion of things ecclesiastical to purposes altogether worldly. The vast treasure swept by sacrilege into the royal coffers, was lost at dicing to such courtiers as Sir Miles Partridge, or squandered upon masks, banquets, rioting, and bribery.\* In all this, there was no thought of benefiting any but the king and his immediate favourites. Rather, where the royal hand dispensed any portion of the spoils, the simple purpose was to buy the courtiers, and so benefit the king. The people were unthought of. They had lost benefactors who had been trained in the old school of Catholic charity; and they might look round in vain among the partisans of "the new learning" for any of the modern organizations of social science. Quite as dreary were their prospects in the following reign. Lingard, in summing up his account of the days of Edward VI., says: "The increasing multitudes of the poor began to resort to the more populous towns in search of that relief which had been formerly distributed at the gates of the monasteries." Then, in a note: "Thus Lever (one of the preachers of the day)

---

\* See the testimony of Bale, an ardent reformer, quoted by Lingard, vol. v. p. 97, note.

exclaims; 'O, merciful Lord! what a number of poor, feeble, halt, blind, lame, sickly, yea, with idle vagabonds and dissembling caitiffs mixed among them, lie and creep, begging in the miry streets of London and Westminster.'—Lingard, vol v., p. 366.

We leave the student of history to pursue this train of thought. He will find that wherever the Church has acted freely, from the days of S. Laurence, the deacon, downwards, the poor have ever been reckoned her ornaments and treasures. Wherever her free action has been controlled or paralyzed by the secular arm, the poor have been by that arm thrust aside, or brought under legislation more cruel than neglect. But, on the basis of these two propositions, we may advance two more. Wherever the state has had the upper hand, there has been the undue accumulation of private wealth, the abject and ruinous depression of the poor, the severance of classes, the loss of a common bond of interest, the disintegration of society. And wherever the Church has exercised her healthful sway, there has been the true political regeneration of man, the "liberty, equality, fraternity," not of revolutions, but of charity; not of brute force, but of balanced, adjusted, and hallowed rights: there has been all that sciologists have aspired to, and empirics have striven to bring about: there have spontaneously grown up and flourished, by a virtue inherent in the soil, more than all the laboured results of mere human social science.

The time, however, is come when a Catholic review, professing to reflect the subjects of the day, would be more than ever deficient were it not to speak out on Social Science, whether within or beyond the Church's pale. An intense and increasing energy in practical charity is among the leading features of our time. Did we not even thankfully acknowledge it, we must be purblind not to perceive it. And we hasten to guard ourselves against a possible misconception of the portrait above sketched, as though it represented any average in the English aristocracy and upper classes. Few things could be further from our thought, as few things could be more untrue. The landed gentry of England are, as a class, kindly, to say the least, towards their poor dependants; many of them actively charitable, up to (sometimes even beyond) the conventional standard. If there are few John Howards and Elizabeth Frys among non-Catholics, either in town or country, it is because the scale of charity inculcated or encouraged in their system seldom reaches the heroic mark of personal self devotion and sacrifice. Rich and good materials are there; the heartiness and practical turn of the

English character, prepared to carry out persistently the scheme of good which it shall clearly see. Englishmen in general, however, have no adequate means afforded them to develop or to consolidate the generous impulses that might lead some even to sacrifice *themselves* for the love of the brethren. They put their hands readily into their pockets when an appeal is made and a subscription opened; witness the noble instances reported almost daily in the columns of the "Times;" witness the sums netted annually by the various societies for home and foreign operations. This is a mode of being charitable easily appreciated, readily acted on, by a great commercial people; and encouraged, certainly, by their religious teachers. But the Established Church cannot be said to hold towards its more zealous children the language which St. Paul addresses to his converts: "I seek not yours, but you." A cheque for £100 is *the* thing: whereas, a supposed vocation to a single life in order to "attend upon the Lord without impediment" is (or was, before the late City panic) far more likely to be a delusion than a balance at the banker's. Macaulay long ago complained of that religion that it did not know how to use enthusiasm; that Wesley and others were driven from its pale because they could not fit its Procrustean standard, while the Catholic Church would have girded the enthusiast with a rope, shaven his crown, utilized his very eccentricity, and sent him ardent and barefoot to preach her doctrines where men of more measured tread would not have found their way. It is the same story still; and we may be thankful for it. Protestant sisterhoods are an eccentric anomaly as great as were Wesley and Whitfield before they left the establishment. They, with Mr. Lyne and his Anglo-benedictines, form the perplexity and discomfort of the authorities whom, in turn, they doubtless consider as "highly unsatisfactory bishops." One by one, they find themselves not at home. Give up their aspirations they cannot; it would be to part with a chief section of their intellectual and moral nature. Yet they find around them no *pabulum* on which those aspirations are to be nourished. An alternative is before them. They must subside into the prescribed stature of the genuine sons and daughters of the Established Church; or they must grow on, be accounted as giants and monsters, and be expelled. At present, like the "ugly duck" in Hans Andersen's story, the undeveloped cygnet is, by its strange and rapid growth a puzzle, an aversion, a terror, to the ducklings around it.

Under some fear of this being considered a roundabout paper, we return to our text. If, as we have said, the deve-



lopment of social science (under whatever name) be a hopeful symptom in the state of a nation, then may we have hope for the present day. Our poor have become an object of public charitable attention to a degree unknown to our grandfathers. Not only are "the claims of property" as involving grave responsibility to landed proprietors, making themselves heard throughout the country. Even in our large cities and towns, the great swarming hives of manufacture and commerce, uninviting, most unpoetic, yet most productive fields of charitable labour, the public mind is stirred with the same thought and care. London itself, whose squalid alleys and palatial squares and gardens present the opposite extremes of human life, has felt the movement, perhaps we may say, has inaugurated it. Nor is it only in public meetings held, brilliant papers read, titled lists of subscriptions, that the impulse is shown. More unobtrusively, meanwhile, hard-worked professional men and delicate women, whose hearts have been roused to see with their own eyes the misery of their fellows, have made their way into the filthy courts and up the rotten stairs, that lead to the crowded garret and to the pallet of squalid sickness. There they have learnt the rudiments of social science; nobly, too, in many instances, have they served their apprenticeship. And from the facts so learned they have framed inductions that have come with the startling force of truth, new and appalling, before the uninitiated and the inexperienced. Other sciences have been worked out in the study or laboratory of the "painful" student, over the alembic, by the ray of the midnight taper, or amid the trying *entourage* of the dissecting room, till the principles of knowledge there gained, tentative at first, and empirical, have resulted in well-approved and scientific systems for the relief of humanity. And so, the science which aims at raising the abject pauper to that share of the decencies and physical comforts of life to which he may lay claim in virtue of his being *man* has proceeded, not on subtle theories, nor *a priori* reasonings, nor unpractical optimism, nor unproved statistics, nor unreasonable aspirations. It has been worked out, carefully and painfully, detail after detail. It has consolidated into a science, not pure and abstract, but practical and efficacious. It has produced our night refuges for the wanderer, our homes for the homeless, our houses of safety for servants out of place, for young needlewomen in want and therefore in peril, our soup-kitchens, model lodging houses, shoe-black brigades, night, "ragged," industrial and cripple schools; with other ingenuities of energetic charity: for we have by no means exhausted our list.

True, our praise of these efforts, and the genuine admiration



they excite, must suffer one chief abatement. They have often become engines of proselytism. Unintentionally, it may be hoped, in some cases, and with no moral fault in the original promoters, but by the mere force of the current of popular opinion, they have drifted into this. Non-Catholics are wealthy, and have been able as well as willing to found charitable institutions on a costly scale. Their doors lie open to all comers; and, among those who present themselves, come the Catholic poor also, children or adult; because the Catholics of London, as a body, are too poor to compete with their neighbours in this race of lordly charity. They have no doors which they can fling so wide, and no means whereby to invite so many. In other cases, however, we cannot shelter non-Catholic institutions under the same plea of mere unconscious and mechanical proselytism. They bear on their very front the brand of that atrocious design: imitators, with more or less consistency of the hospital in Dublin, named (or mis-named) after a royal lady, now deceased, whose life was marked by a gentle and liberal charity. In that hospital, as we have lately read in the public prints, the poor Catholic, whom even a sudden street-accident drives within its walls, finds himself, when restored to consciousness, utterly denied the ministrations of his religion. He has the choice of being carried out in a blanket to receive them in a neighbouring house, or dying the death of a mere animal within its walls.

We end these desultory remarks by laying before our readers the two documents already named at the head of our article, and which speak for themselves. We hope on future occasions to treat at length, not only on the particular topic of the education of the Catholic poor, but also on the many kindred subjects which that topic suggests. On one of these kindred subjects—the treatment endured by Catholic children in English workhouses—we have peculiar pleasure in referring to two inimitable articles, in *The Month* of last March and April, which have appeared under the title *De Profundis*. If there be any one of our readers who has not already studied these articles, let him lose no time in doing so. More forcible reasoning, more persuasive eloquence, more telling facts more tellingly told, we have never seen.

And we sincerely hope, that God may requite the excellent writer with that earthly reward which he most covets; full success in his momentous appeal. But we will detain our readers no longer from the terse and suggestive heads contained in the following papers.

## ASSOCIATION OF THE SACRED HEART,

FOR THE EDUCATION OF THE CHILDREN OF THE POOR IN LONDON.

On the 16th of October last the following petition was presented to his Holiness Pius IX. :—

“HOLY FATHER,—

“In order to promote the compassion of the Faithful for the thousands of children exposed to danger and daily perishing in the streets of London, and to kindle more and more a zeal for souls among us, the Archbishop of Westminster humbly prays that your Holiness will graciously bestow on each and all of the Faithful who give their name to him to further this work a plenary Indulgence on the usual conditions, on the day of enrolment, and also on the Pastor Bonus Sunday, the Second after Easter, on the Feast of the Epiphany, and on the Feast of the Maternity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, so long as they shall persevere in the Association : and moreover, a hundred days’ Indulgence as often as they shall in any way co-operate in the salvation of children.

“Feast of the Maternity of the B.V.M., 1865.”

In bestowing these Indulgences, his Holiness deigned to write with his own hand these words :—

“Granted in the usual form of the Church. ‘Suffer little ones to come to Me.’ ‘For their angels behold the face of the Father who is in Heaven.’

“Oct. 16, 1865.”

“PIUS PP. IX.”

The conditions on which the above indulgences may be obtained are—

- I. Confession, Communion, and prayer for the intention of the Sovereign Pontiff, as usual.
- II. Enrolment in the Association, by giving the name to me, either directly or indirectly, through the first priest of any Mission, or through any religious who may be the confessor of the person to be enrolled.
- III. Co-operation in the work, in whatsoever form each person may choose.

In order that this co-operation may be real and effectual, the following precise heads are given. Any one personally assisting in any of these or similar works will be deemed to fulfil this condition.

1. Seeking out Catholic children who are not in school, and making a census of them.
2. Visiting the homes of their parents, and urging them to send their children to school.
3. Taking charge of one or more children or families, and watching over the attendance of such children at school.

4. Instructing children who may be from any cause kept from school, or who may have left it, at their own homes or elsewhere.
5. Forming or assisting in Night schools, especially those for boys.
6. Conducting children to Mass on Sundays and Feasts of obligation.
7. Teaching in Confraternities of Christian doctrine, and the like, or in Sunday schools.
8. Visiting and encouraging the Teachers of schools, by showing interest in their work, and by presents of books, &c.
9. Encouraging the children, by giving rewards and annual recreations.
10. Assisting any children who show a fitness or desire to become School Teachers.
11. Watching over one or more, whether boys or girls, who have entered into employment and service, by communicating with them through their masters or employers.
12. Providing means for making the days of first Communion and of Confirmation more marked and solemn.
13. Distributing good books, rosaries, and objects of piety among children.
14. Providing means for retreats for children in convents or otherwise.
15. Subscribing to any existing Catholic school, parochial or other, as Reformatory or Industrial schools, to Orphanages, Refuges, the Immaculate Conception Charity, or any other work for the benefit of children.
16. Assisting to found new schools or houses of religious for the care of children.
17. Subscribing to the Central Diocesan Fund for Education.
18. Employing time and gifts, natural and acquired, in work of any kind which may be sold for the benefit of this Association.
19. Forming and directing a permanent system by which such works shall be regularly received and exposed for sale.
20. Forming circles of twelve persons to collect alms for any existing School, Refuge, or Orphanage.
21. Teaching and directing Schools as Managers, Masters, Mistresses, Pupil Teachers, or Assistants.

I need not explicitly say that the last condition is already abundantly satisfied by the Clergy Secular and Regular, and by all Religious of whatsoever order, who at this time are so zealously and compassionately labouring to teach and to save our poor children. No further enrolment of their names is needed than that which already inscribes them in the Ecclesiastical order of the Diocese.

To ensure a real participation in some one or more of these ways of co-operating in the work of the poor children, all persons associating themselves will definitely fix upon the kind of assistance they will undertake, and will state the same to the Rector of the Mission in which they reside, to their director, or to the Secretaries of the Association.

The direction of the Association is entrusted to the Diocesan Council of Education, assisted by the Diocesan Inspector, the Rev. R. G. Macmullen, the Rev. W. Burke, the Rev. W. H. Anderdon, the Rev. F. Roberts, and a certain number of officers in each Mission.

I refrain from all other words in calling on you to help me in this work of mercy, which must be perseveringly done from school to school, street to street, house to house, save only the words of our Divine Redeemer: "It is not the will of your Father who is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish."—S. Matth. xviii. 14. "And whosoever shall give to drink to one of those little ones a cup of cold water only in the name of a disciple, amen I say to you, he shall not lose his reward."—S. Matth. x. 42.

✠ HENRY EDWARD,  
*Archbishop of Westminster.*

Christmas, 1865.

### WESTMINSTER DIOCESAN FUND.

The following figures represent, with as much certainty as is at present attainable, the extent of education among our Catholic Poor, and the needs which are to be supplied.

1. The two following statements are made by as accurate estimates as we are able to arrive at.

The first estimate gives :

Population of the Diocese .....	175,000	
Children of age to be at School .....	29,000	
Children well educated .....	11,000	} 29,000
Children insufficiently educated .....	11,000	
Children without education .....	7,000	

The second estimate gives :

Population .....	150,000 or 160,000	
Children .....	30,000 or 35,000	} 30,000 or 35,000
Children of higher and middle class .....	5,000	
Poor Children who ought to be in School .....	25,000 or 30,000	
Poor Children well educated .....	15,000	
Poor Children really or practically uneducated .....	10,000 or 15,000	

I may here observe that the 148 Schools of the Diocese cannot contain more than 15,000 Children, so that there is not School room, at this time, for more than one half of our poor Children, if attending daily.

As to Children who may be called uneducated, the second statement gives as a mean number 12,000. But in order to avoid all risk of exaggeration, I will take the first estimate; and, passing over the Children insufficiently educated, who are put at 11,000, will take only the 7,000 Children who, in this estimate, are stated as altogether without education, that is, without means of education.

In order to provide for these 7,000 Children, 35 Schools capable of holding 200 each would be required.

In order to provide 35 such Schools, at least £200 a year for each School would be required, or an annual income of £7,000.

2. It is more than probable that above 1,000 Catholic Children are now detained in Workhouse Schools.

By the same computation five Schools of 200 each would be needed to receive this second class; but inasmuch as these Children would be, not day scholars, but entirely maintained, a larger sum would be needed for each School. Supposing the maintenance to be provided out of the public rates, not less than £400 a year would be further required for the rent and management of each of such Schools, or in other words £2,000 a year.

3. To this must be added that we possess in the Diocese one Reformatory School for Boys, one Industrial School for Boys, and one for Girls.

We are at this moment compelled to refuse both Boys and Girls for want of room.

To render these three existing Institutions adequate to the needs of London, at least an income of £1,000 a year would be required.

I pass by, for the present, all other subjects relating to our Schools, for which an income is needed, such as the encouragement of Pupil Teachers and Masters, who are now often lost to us, by the smallness of their remuneration. I confine myself to the vital necessity of saving the poor Children who are ready to perish.

From the figures above given it is evident that a sum of £10,000 a year would barely suffice for the present needs of our destitute Children, putting the number of them at the lowest figure.

Now I have slender hope of seeing this sum raised in my life-time. But I have a perfect confidence that it will be raised hereafter. My successors will see the fulfilment of what we now begin; but if we do not make the beginning, their work will be indefinitely retarded. I shall be content if I may see the Fund created, and the work begun.

It may be safely affirmed that every £100 causes the expenditure of £200, arising from Government grants, weekly payments, and local contributions. If I could raise an income of £1,000 a year for this Fund, I do not doubt that a further sum of £2,000 a year would be called into activity. If the Fund were raised to £3,000 a year, probably the whole sum of £10,000 a year would be added to our work of education.

It is to aid me in this vital work that I now appeal to you by every motive of the Faith: above all, for the love of souls.

Donations will, of course, be of great service in purchasing, or fitting up of Houses and Schools.

But Subscriptions to create an annual income are far more necessary.

I would ask of you to give your name for as large an annual sum as it is in your power to afford for the first formation of this work. After a few years I trust it will have gathered to itself sufficient contributions to ensure its perpetuity and its extension. As in the case of a Refuge or Orphanage, the chief difficulties are at the outset. If it can be assisted for the three or five

first years, it can almost always thenceforward go alone. So it is with the first creation of this Diocesan Fund.

I would, therefore, with all the earnestness and urgency I can, beg of the charity and generosity of the Faithful to render their fullest assistance, by contributing for three, five, or seven years, as large a Subscription as they are able.

Every hundred a year secured for three years would probably enable me to establish a School, which, once in activity, would gradually gather to itself the means of its own subsistence, and thereby set free the original grant for the founding of another School.

And I would ask of you the further kindness of a reply as speedily as you conveniently can. It would be rendering a double help to this effort if you would enable me to announce your name and contribution at the Meeting to be held at St. James's Hall on Thursday, June 14th, at One o'clock, to which I earnestly invite you.

I will add only the words of our Divine Master, for whom, and in whose Name, I ask your help. "It is not the will of your Father who is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish."

✠ HENRY EDWARD,

*Archbishop of Westminster.*

Almost while these sheets are wet in the printing-office, a meeting has been held in St. James's Hall which cannot fail to give an impetus to the especial department of Social Science referred to in the preceding documents; the Catholic education of our poor neglected children. Under the presidency of his Grace the Archbishop, a series of resolutions, moved and seconded by influential laymen and priests, pledged the meeting and the Catholic public to strenuous exertions to rescue our poor little "Arabs" from ignorance, from vice, and from proselytism. A correspondence, as our readers are aware, had previously debated in the Catholic papers a question comparatively unimportant. That question was, the figure at which were to be placed these wandering tribes. We call it unimportant by comparison, because, as the Archbishop has most truly said in his late pastoral:—

It may be safely affirmed that thousands of Catholic children in London are without education. Two very careful and guarded calculations have been lately made of the number who may be said to be practically without education. One of these estimates them at twelve thousand, the other at seven thousand. We refrain from giving our own conjectures, wishing to avoid all semblance of exaggeration, and earnestly hoping that we may be mistaken. But if there be twelve thousand, or even seven thousand, or so much as one thousand Catholic children growing up without Christian and Catholic education, we ought to do penance unless we make an effort to save them.



That there are not one thousand only, but seven thousand at least, may, we believe, with perfect certainty be affirmed. And if so, it is a fact sufficiently terrible and appalling to tinge all needless self-indulgence with bitterness, and to break our indolent peace day and night. The ruin and depravity, or the perversion and apostasy of one baptized child is a sorrow which breaks the heart of a father or a mother. The loss of one soul, and that one of God's little ones, only the other day innocent and in union with God, makes a wound in the sacred heart of Jesus. How is it that we can eat and drink, lie down and rise up in unconsciousness and insensibility at the spiritual death of thousands before our eyes?

If in any one place a thousand children without education were to be seen together, we should be horrified. But though scattered, they exist, and they are as destitute as if they were all congregated in one of our maze of courts. Being dispersed, they are hidden by fives and by tens here and there in our thronging population, and therefore escape our eyes; and because they are not seen, some doubt of their existence. Let us therefore lay well to heart that we see but little of that which, by its very nature, lies withdrawn from the eyes of Catholics, namely, the Catholics who, neglecting their own souls, neglect also the souls of their children. Such Catholics keep out of our sight.

We have only space to add, that the response to an appeal thus calmly, though most earnestly made; based, not on rhetoric, but on facts as proved by statistics, and falling by their own weight on the public mind, has been most encouraging. More than a thousand pounds were announced as the immediate result of the meeting itself: making up, we are informed, a total of some £6,700 since the first of the two foregoing papers was issued. But the good elicited will go further than this. Even money falls short of the value of public opinion. We live in times of strange disruptions, and stranger coalitions. If we can establish the fact, that while our needs are great, our grievances are yet greater; if we can show that our children, with no crime but poverty, are left to the alternative of the open evils of the universal street, or the secluded evils of non-Catholic institutions, we shall ultimately have the public mind of England as a Minos to pronounce on our behalf a *splendidum arbitrium*, and the *Times* newspaper as a Mercury of most eloquent pleading.

## ART. VII.—THE NEGRO IN AFRICA AND THE WEST INDIES.

*The Albert Nyanza, Great Basin of the White Nile, and Explorations of the Nile Sources.* By SAMUEL WHITE BAKER, M.A. With Maps, Illustrations, and Portraits. 2 Volumes. Macmillan. 1866.

IN two most interesting volumes, which it is hardly possible to lay down when once taken up, Mr. Baker records, simply and unaffectedly, the history of an important geographical discovery. Speke and Grant had already proved that one source of the Nile was from a vast lake, lying exactly under the Equator, in longitude  $33^{\circ}$  East, and which they called by the name of our Queen. They had traced the river which issues from the north end of this lake almost continuously about one hundred and fifty miles, to the great Karuma Falls, at which it suddenly turns from its southerly course and runs due west. In that direction they were prevented from penetrating by a war among the natives; they therefore proceeded to the south, and struck the Nile again after going about one hundred miles. It was then flowing towards the south-east, at a level near 1,000 feet lower than that of the Victoria Nyanza. What was more important, it had been flooded when Speke and Grant left it, and was free from flood when they again met it. This circumstance alone would have convinced them that it had passed through a lake which, not having as yet been overfilled, had absorbed the flood. The native accounts, moreover, stated that (after passing the Karuma Falls) it ran westward for several days, and then fell into what they called the Luta N'zige, or "dead Locust Lake." Speke, on their authority, believed this to be a small lake. Mr. Baker has explored a considerable part of it, but without ascertaining exactly either its southern or northern shore. It is at least as large as the Victoria Nyanza itself, probably much larger. It extends 170 miles farther north, and according to the native accounts, much farther to the South also. This vast inland sea, not improbably as large as any even in North America, is called by Mr. Baker the Albert Nyanza. It lies about seventy miles west of the Victoria Nyanza, 2,248 feet above the sea, and receives the torrents which flow in abundance down the lofty mountains which bound the great Nile basin to the west. These were seen from the lake, towering at least 7,000 feet above it, and are

subject to the full violence of tropical rains. The Nile may probably have other feeders, perhaps some from other great lakes; be this, however, as it may, English adventurers in our day have solved the problem which has puzzled the civilized world at least since the days of Herodotus. More remarkable still, the last, and by no means the least, important discovery, has been shared by a lady. Mrs. Baker, "whose life yet dawned at so early an age, that womanhood was still a future," replied to all the representations of her husband as to the dangers of the route, in the words of Ruth, "Entreat me not to leave thee, or to return from following after thee; for whither thou goest I will go, and where thou lodgest I will lodge; where thou diest I will die, and there will I be buried; the Lord do so to me and more also, if aught but death part thee and me." Accordingly she actually bore him company through dangers compared with which, those of a series of general engagements would have been slight, and after multiplied hair-breadth escapes returned with him in safety. Mr. Baker delights to tell with a generous glow of admiration, how the expedition must have failed more than once, without her presence of mind and ready wit. How great the field opened by our modern explorers has been, is plain enough by merely looking at the map. Thirty years ago Bruce was believed to have discovered the sources of the Nile. The southern shore of the Victoria Nyanza is nearly twice as far from the Delta as is the source of Bruce's Nile. It is possible that the extremity of the Albert Nyanza itself, or some other source, may be much farther still.

We must not allow ourselves to accompany this daring couple all through their dangers and discoveries. On the point of starting from the limits of European life, they detected a plot among their own followers to mutiny and murder Mr. Baker. Dangers and difficulties seemed to multiply at every step. Impossibilities met them everywhere, if they had not resolved, with Napoleon, not to admit the vile word. Nothing less than an obstinacy, which would have been called mad if it had not succeeded, could have prevented their turning back at every step. Everything had to be overcome, and there were no means of overcoming it. They are over and over again abandoned, betrayed, and plotted against by their own followers, beset by the natives, and far worse, by the Turkish slave traders, (who regarded them as spies,) exhausted by starvation, baked by the sun, and poisoned by multiform miasmata. Nothing could have effected their success except an iron resolution to succeed in spite of impossibilities. Mrs. Baker has a sun-stroke which produces brain fever. Her husband himself, so

ill as hardly to be able to walk, "marched by the side of her litter" without sleeping for seven nights.

Nature could resist no longer. We reached a village one evening. She had been in violent convulsions successively ; it was all but over. I laid her down on her litter within a hut, covered her with a Scotch plaid, and fell upon my mat insensible, worn out with sorrow and fatigue. My men put a new handle to my pickaxe that evening, and sought for a dry spot to dig her grave. The sun had risen when I woke. I had slept, and, horrified as the idea flashed upon me that she must be dead, and that I had not been with her, I started up. She lay upon her bed pale as marble, and with that calm serenity that the features assume when the cares of life no longer act upon the mind, and the body rests in death. The dreadful thought bowed me down ; but, as I gazed upon her in fear, her chest gently heaved—not with the convulsive throbs of fever—but naturally. She was asleep ; and, when at a sudden noise she opened her eyes, they were calm and clear. She was saved. When not a ray of hope remained, God alone knows what helped us ! The gratitude of that moment I will not attempt to describe (vol. ii., p. 89).

Things are nearest mending when they have come to the worst. A few days later, Mr. Baker "rushed into the lake, and, thirsty with heat and fatigue, with a heart full of gratitude, drank freely of the sources of the Nile." They established themselves at a fishing village called Vacovia, where harpoons for the hippopotamus were as common as nets at Hastings.

The beach was perfectly clear sand, upon which the waves rolled like those of the sea, throwing up weeds precisely as seaweed may be seen in England. It was a grand sight to look upon this reservoir of the mighty Nile, and to watch the heavy swell tumbling upon the beach, while far to the south-west the eye searched as vainly for a bound as though upon the Atlantic.

The shore was strewn with the bones of immense fish, hippopotami, and crocodiles ; but the latter reptiles were merely caught in revenge for any outrage committed by them, as their flesh was looked upon with disgust by the natives of Unyoro. They were so numerous and voracious in the lake that the natives cautioned us not to allow the women to venture into the water even to the knees when filling their water-jars.

At Vacovia, where all the party suffered from fever, he at last contrived to get boats and began his journey home by rowing southward along the east coast of the lake. The crocodile and hippopotamus swarmed in the water, and the elephant upon the shore. They came to a floating promontory. A mass of vegetable matter had accumulated and papyrus had grown upon it, till the mass was firm enough to support a man, who could walk "merely sinking above his ankles in soft ouze. Beneath this raft of vegetation was extremely deep

water." "One day a tremendous gale of wind and heavy sea broke off large portions, and the wind acting upon the rushes like sails, carried floating islands of some acres about the lake to be deposited wherever they might happen to pitch." After meeting one furious storm in a navigation of about one hundred miles north, they came to Magungo, the place of which they had so long heard where the Nile enters the lake, about eighteen miles from the outlet by which it passes north. After going up the river far enough to prove its identity with that discovered by Speke, they began the really terrible task; the land journey north to Gondokoro, the village and slave depôt from which they had started. The details of this journey, which are most interesting, we omit. We copy, however, with real regret, part of the following passage, describing their plans at a time when they were both nearly dead between famine and fever.

We had now given up all hope of Gondokoro, and were perfectly resigned to our fate. This, we felt sure, was to be buried in Chopi. I wrote instructions in my journal, in case of death, and told my head-man to be sure to deliver my maps, observations, and papers to the English Consul at Khar-toum. This was my only care, as I feared that all my labour might be lost, if I should die. I had no fear for my wife, as she was quite as bad as I, and if one should die the other would certainly follow; in fact, this had been agreed upon lest she should fall into the hands of Kamrasi at my death. We had struggled hard to win, and I thanked God we had won; if death were to be the price, at all events we were at the goal, and we both looked upon death rather as a pleasure, as affording *rest*; there would be no more suffering, no fever, no long journey before us, that in our weak state was an infliction; the only wish was to lay down the burden (vol. ii., p. 161).

At last the king, Kamrasi, who had left them to come as near as might be to actual death, in order to make his own terms, sent for them. Mr. Baker saved him from Turkish invaders by hoisting the British flag, and declaring his country annexed to the dominion of Queen Victoria. He recovered himself from the gates of death by manufacturing whisky from sweet potatoes to the great delight of King Kamrasi, who will be likely enough to poison himself and his people by the use he means to make of the secret. At last he managed to start once more homeward. Danger still dogged them by water and by land. The boat in which they descended the Nile was visited with the plague. Their followers died one after another. The vessel was so horribly offensive as to be unbearable. "All night we could hear the sick, muttering and raging in delirium; but from years of association with disagreeables, we had no fear of infection."

The extracts we have given will be enough to prove that

Mr. Baker's book is a contrast to most books of African travel, which are usually as dry and monotonous as the deserts they describe. Mr. Baker must have had tediousness enough, but he does not bestow any of it on his readers. He has given us one of the most readable and interesting books we have seen for a long time. This is owing both to the spirit with which he tells his adventures, and to his understanding how to leave untold, as well as how to tell. His whole voyage occupied about four years and a half, from March, 1861, to the autumn of 1865, when he once more came into European life at the great English hotel at Suez, and found himself among a crowd of his countrymen and countrywomen.

There are phases of savage life which exert an irresistible attraction over any who have once become habituated to them. Such is not the life of the African savage. Mr. Baker's journal says, "There is no difference in any of these savages. If hungry they will fawn upon you; and when filled they will desert. I believe that ten years' residence in the Soudan and in this country would spoil an angel, and would turn the best heart to stone." He believes, on insufficient grounds, that these nations are without the idea of God or of a future state, and apparently he would add of good or evil; and this leads him to suggest the strange theory, that they are the remains of a race older than Adam. He says, p. 316:—

Whether the man of central Africa be pre-Adamite is impossible to determine. But the idea is suggested by the following data. The historical origin of man, or Adam, commences with a knowledge of God. Throughout the history of the world, from the creation of Adam, God is connected with mankind in every creed, whether worshipped as the universal sublime Spirit of Omnipotence, or shaped by the forms of idolatry into representations of a deity. From the creation of Adam mankind has acknowledged its inferiority, and must bow down and worship either the true God or a graven image—a something that is in heaven or in earth. The world, as we accept that term, was always actuated by a natural religious instinct. Cut off from that world; lost in the mysterious distance that shrouded the origin of the Egyptian Nile, were races unknown that had never been reckoned in the great sum of history—races that we have brought to light, whose existence had been hidden from mankind, and that now appear before us like the fossil bones of antediluvian animals. Are they vestiges of what existed in a pre-Adamite creation?

To do him justice, the author does not seem to have been aware that he was touching an important religious question; or that any one could be shocked at his theory on religious grounds. Considering the prevalent tone of Protestant society in our



day, this is not wonderful. But we do wonder that he did not see that the theory of race, which he suggests in this and another passage, would undermine the first principles of the greatest and most important difference, between the social condition of the Christian and the heathen worlds. Ancient heathen society was built upon the theory that each race and nation was the growth of its own soil, and had its own gods, its own modes of worship, its own rule of right and wrong. Hence, the most civilized nation of the heathen world deliberately held, that towards men of any other race they had no duties, except such as they might voluntarily have undertaken by treaty—men ἑκπαυδοὶ had no rights. The first principles of modern society, on the other hand, are built upon the great truth declared by S. Paul to the Athenians: *Deus fecit ex uno* [Greek ἐξ ἑνὸς αἷματος] *omne genus hominum inhabitare super universam faciem terræ*: and on the restoration of that truth to practical power in the Christian world, *ubi non est Gentilis et Judæus, circumcisio et præputium, barbarus et Scythæ, servus et liber, sed omnia et in omnibus Christus*. To destroy the belief in man's unity of race, is not only to assail a most vital and fundamental truth of Christianity, but to undermine the very foundation of European civilization.

It is only natural that those who assume that different human families are distinct species, should go on to infer that like the different species of brutes, each has its own nature, and however it may be trained cannot rise above it. Mr. Baker accepts this consequence in the fullest sense. His estimate of negro nature is:—

In childhood I believe the negro to be in advance, in intellectual quickness, of the white child of a similar age, but the mind does not expand—it promises fruit, but does not ripen; and the negro man has grown in body, but has not advanced in intellect. The puppy of three months old is superior in intelligence to a child of the same age; but the mind of the child expands, while that of the dog has arrived at its limit. In the great system of creation that divided races and subdivided them according to mysterious laws, apportioning special qualities to each, the varieties of the human race exhibit certain characters and qualifications which adapt them for specific localities. The natural character of those races will not alter with a change of locality, but the instincts of each race will be developed in any country where they may be located. Thus, the English are as English in Australia, India, and America as they are in England; and in every locality they exhibit the industry and energy of their native land; even so the African will remain negro in all his natural instincts, although transplanted to other soils; and those natural instincts being a love of idleness and savagedom, he will assuredly relapse into an idle and savage state unless specially



governed, and forced to industry. The history of the negro has proved the correctness of this theory. In no instance has he evinced other than a retrogression, when once freed from restraint. Like a horse without harness, he runs wild ; but, if harnessed, no animal is more useful.\* There are productions necessary to civilized countries which can be cultivated only in tropical climates, where the white man cannot live if exposed to labour in the sun. Thus, such fertile countries as the West Indies and portions of America being without a native population, the negro was originally imported as a slave to fulfil the conditions of a labourer ; and in the state of slavery the negro was compelled to work, and through his labour every country prospered where he had been introduced. He was suddenly freed ; and from that moment he refused to work ; and, instead of being a useful member of society, he not only became a useless burden to the community, but a plotter and intriguer, imbued with a deadly hatred to the white man who had generously declared him free. Now, as the negro was originally imported as a labourer, but now refuses to labour, it is self-evident that he is a miserable failure. Either he must be compelled to work by some stringent law against vagrancy, or those beautiful countries that prospered under the conditions of negro forced industry must yield to ruin under negro freedom and idle independence. For an example of the results, look to St. Domingo.

Mr. Baker's view, therefore, is, that no education, no training, no change of circumstances, can make of the negro anything else than an idle, bloody-minded savage ; that he cannot be induced to work except by force ; that our fundamental mistake has been to suppose that, in time and after due preparation, the posterity of African savages might be prepared for the influence of the same motives which operate upon Europeans—such as the desire of maintaining themselves and their families. We might just as well have hoped that, by careful training for several generations, we should teach our household dogs to speak, read, and write, or our horses to fly. In fact, negroes will work only under compulsion, they are not capable of any other motive.

Unfortunately Mr. Baker's theory on this matter exactly falls in with the prejudices of the educated classes in our days. Public opinion, in all free countries, but especially in England, is governed by reactions, and the last thirty years have brought about a wonderful reaction of feeling with regard to all the less favoured families of the human race. Mr. Trevelyan gives a curious and by no means pleasant account of the change of feeling in Europeans towards the natives of India. Thirty years ago the term

---

\* Space alone compels us to make many omissions in this passage, which extends from pp. 287 to 294, vol. ii. If we could have given the whole, the author's theory would have been more strongly exhibited.

for them was "the mild Hindoo," now it is the "damned nigger." The same change is strongly manifested in the comments upon the wars in New Zealand and the Cape Colony. But it is strongest with regard to the negro. Thirty years ago he was decidedly the fashion. This was natural enough. The British public felt towards the emancipated slaves as a fine lady is apt to feel towards a remarkably ugly and useless pet-dog, upon whom in the exercise of her sovereign caprice she has been pleased to fix her affections; or as parents are apt to feel towards a spoiled child who is ugly, a little wanting, and very disagreeable in temper, and whom, on these grounds, every one else votes to be intolerable. In all such cases it is notorious that the general dislike only endears the favourite to those, who have come, somehow or other, to identify it with themselves. Julia Mannering (a keen observer of character) declared that her father patronised on this principle Dominie Sampson and a remarkably hideous pug-dog, because no one else could endure them. Then the tendency to make much of those to whom we have done some special favour and benefit, is as natural and as strong as that which leads men to hate those whom they have injured. The British public felt that it had made a real and great sacrifice for the negroes. It had bought them for twenty millions sterling, and it was not going to admit that it had made a bad bargain. Besides, a more generous feeling told in the same direction. The negroes had unquestionably been illtreated, and were just restored to the rights of humanity. An educated negro was a lion in London society. He was not made quite so much of as Garibaldi was the other day, by plenty of people who heartily hate revolution, of which all the rest of the world regard him as the type. But the feeling was of the same sort.

From all this any farsighted man might have foretold a great reaction. For the reigning enthusiasm could not fail to raise expectations which could not possibly be realized, and the disappointment must be provoking. The emancipated negro was to be a bright example to all the world of the blessed effects of British freedom and a proof of British wisdom. All this would not have been expected of any savages whom chance might have thrown upon some West Indian island. But too much could not be expected from slaves emancipated upon principles of pure humanity and at so great a cost. Strange to say, it was forgotten that one main argument against slavery had always been that it made the slave unfit for freedom and the master unfit to deal with free labourers. Because these

poor people had been trained up in the worst possible school, and because they were left to be governed by a local legislature composed of ex-slave owners, who had opposed their emancipation to the last moment, and had always predicted that it must lead to irremediable evils, therefore people came to the conclusion that the emancipated negroes were sure to exhibit to the whole world a bright example of the good effects of free labour. No reasonable man under such circumstances would have been surprised or disappointed if the experiment had wholly failed. We are told it has wholly failed, and in proof of this we are bid to look at Jamaica and Hayti.

This is at first sight unreasonable. Jamaica and Hayti are only two out of a large number of countries inhabited by emancipated slaves. Even if emancipation had failed there, it might have succeeded elsewhere. The *Statesman's Manual* for 1864 gives the coloured population of the British West India Islands as 1,003,407, of which only 427,439 are in Jamaica. What accounts have we of the others?

The best authority for an answer to this question will be found in the returns made to the British Government by the Governors of the different islands. But as it is not every one who has opportunity and leisure to examine them, we are glad to be able to refer to one more easily consulted. The substance of these returns is very ably epitomized in an article in the *Edinburgh Review* for April, 1859, which is commonly attributed to the present member of Parliament for East Surrey, Mr. Charles Buxton. We shall here make use of some of the quotations given by him, only assuring our readers that whenever we have had any occasion of verifying the fairness of his statements we have found them fully borne out. Our only difficulty is that his matter is so closely compressed and so exactly to the point that it is hardly possible to make any real use of it without quoting nearly the whole of his article.

First, then, under slavery, the West India Islands produced only one or two staples. The reason of this is simple. Slave labour is reluctant labour, and therefore can be effectually used only when compulsion can be brought to bear upon it. A "gang" of men digging holes, with a driver behind armed with a long whip, can be kept to their work. The consequence is, that slave labour can be profitably employed only in certain kinds of cultivation. Professor Cairns says—"If the work be such that a large gang can be employed with efficiency under the eye of a single overseer, the expense of superintendence will be slight. If, on the other hand, the nature of the work requires that the workmen should be dispersed over an

extended area, the number of overseers, and therefore the cost of the labour which requires this supervision, will be proportionally increased. Thus the cost of slave labour varies directly with the degree in which the work to be done requires dispersion of the labourers, and inversely as it admits of their concentration." He shows, also, that slave labour is "reluctant," "unskilful," and "eminently defective in point of versatility." The result of this was, that under slavery the West India Islands, second in fertility to no country on earth, imported the food of all classes from the Governor to the labourer. Their exports were only two or three staples—sugar, coffee, &c. Of course, therefore, no decrease in the production of sugar, after slavery was abolished, would prove that the people did not work, unless they produced nothing else instead. As a matter of fact, however, the fifteen British sugar colonies\* exported to Great Britain (in 1855-6-7), 7,427,618 cwt. of sugar, against 7,405,849 cwt. in the three last years of negro slavery. Of rum they exported, under slavery, 2,722,880 gallons; under freedom, 4,674,602 gallons. These exports were only to Great Britain. Under the old system the colonies were prohibited to trade with other countries, and therefore the export to Great Britain was their whole exchangeable produce. They are now at liberty to trade where and with whom they please, and a profitable trade is carried on with Australia, the United States, and other countries, of which we have no account.

The tonnage which entered inwards to eight islands (of the other seven we have not the return) was increased in 1857 by 62,042 tons. The total increase must be much larger.

The *Edinburgh* gives some extracts from the reports of the different Governors, adding, "we have always taken the last accounts we could find. But Governors very often send reports full of local affairs, with no reference to the general state of the island. In all cases, the later the report the more gratifying it is found to be." We can fully corroborate this statement from a toilsome examination of many later reports. But here are some extracts.

The Governor of Tobago, in 1859, says—"I deny that the peasantry are abandoned to slothfulness. On the contrary, I

---

\* This number is obtained by leaving out Mauritius, in which the production is enormously increased owing to immigration, and Jamaica, in which, owing to causes into which we will not enter at present, there has been a great diminution. The remaining colonies are Barbadoes, Dominica, Granada, Montserrat, Nevis, St. Kitts, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Tobago, Tortola, Trinidad, the Bahamas, Demerara, and Berbice.

assert that a more industrious class does not exist in the world—at least, when working for themselves.”

Sir Charles Grey writes, in 1852—“There are few races of men who will work harder or more perseveringly, when they are sure of getting for themselves the whole produce of their labour.”

Dr. Davey, an independent and scientific observer, says—“It is a mistake often committed to suppose that the African is by nature indolent—less inclined to work than the European. He who has witnessed, as I have, their indefatigable and prudent industry, will be disposed probably to overrate rather than underrate the activity of the negro, and his love of, or rather I would say his non-aversion to, labour.”

To this we may add the testimony of the present Earl Grey. It would probably be impossible to name a single British statesman whose judgments are so calm, so little influenced either by prepossessions or by excitement. He has, moreover, had unusual and exceptional opportunities of forming a judgment on this particular subject from the offices he has filled. In the debate this year upon the Jamaica Government Bill, while arguing that the Jamaica negroes were not fit for the political franchise, he said that they were an eminently industrious race.

We will give another testimony from Mr. Sewell, the author of a book called the “Ordeal of Free Labour.” He is an American, and visited Jamaica in 1860 (as he expressly tells us), sharing to the full the opinion prevalent in the United States, that the negroes will not work except as slaves. His own observation soon convinced him to the contrary. He writes—

“We have heard in the United States of the abandonment of properties in the West Indies, and without much investigation have listened to the planter’s excuse, the indolence of the negro who refuses to work except under compulsion. But I shall be able to show, that in those colonies where estates have been abandoned, the labouring classes, instead of passing from servitude to indolence, have set up for themselves, and that small proprietors, since emancipation, have increased an hundredfold. It is a fact which speaks volumes, that within the last fifteen years, in spite of the extraordinary price of land and the low rate of wages, the small proprietors of Barbadoes holding less than five acres have increased from 1,100 to 3,537. A large majority of these proprietors were formerly slaves, subsequently free labourers, and finally land-owners. This is certainly an evidence of industrious habits, and a remarkable contradiction of the prevailing notion that

the negro will work only under compulsion." Of Trinidad he writes, "I have taken some pains to trace the Creole labourers of Trinidad from the time of emancipation, after they left the estates and dispersed, to the present day; and the great majority of them can, I think, be followed, step by step, not downward in the path of idleness and poverty, but upward in the scale of civilization to positions of greater independence."\*

From Antigua the Governor reports in 1858, "Satisfactory evidence is afforded by the revenue returns of increase in trade and mercantile business, consequent upon the revival of agricultural prosperity."

The Bahamas.—"The rapidity with which these islands are advancing is indicated by the fact that the exports and imports rose from £201,497 in 1854 to £304,421 in 1855, being an increase of £102,924 in one year. Twenty-three vessels were built in the colony in the year 1855." (Report of 1856.) In 1851 the Governor reports "a great and important change for the better" in the condition of the people, which he mainly attributes to improved education.

Barbadoes, 1853.—"Vast increase of trade." "So far the success of cultivation by free labour in Barbadoes is unquestionable." "In 1851 more sugar was shipped from this island than in any one year since it was peopled; and it is a remarkable fact that there will be more *labourers'* sugar made this year than previously. Sugar exported in 1842, 21,545 hogsheads; in 1852, 48,785; the increase being 27,240 hogsheads."

In 1858, "A large increase in the value of exports. The large proportion of land acquired by the labouring classes furnishes striking proof of their industry."

The latest report from Barbadoes is unfavourable as to the amount of the crop. The recent crops have been—1859, 40,343 hogsheads; 1860, 43,365; 1861, 49,845; 1862, 46,078; 1863, 42,436. The Governor adds, "I regret that the crop of this year is again below that of the preceding year, and was equal only to 36,107 hogsheads. The wonder is how, with the droughts of 1863 and the early part of 1864, the one following so immediately after the other, it has been possible to extract even that quantity of sugar from the parched and shallow soil of this extraordinary little place. *It says a great deal for the perseverance and industry of the people.*"

Dominica, 1858.—"The steady maintenance of production is full of promise as to the future." The exports show a considerable increase under the heads of sugar, rum, coffee, cocoa,

\* Quoted by Cairns, page 39.



oranges, fruit, hides, hard wood, and cotton. In 1857 "very considerable increase in revenue, and an equally marked improvement in the amount of imports." The Governor also dwells upon "the industry of the bulk of the population, and on the great amount of general comfort and independence among the labouring classes in which their industry has resulted." "The native labourer, whose growing independence is manifested in the small 'patches of canes and little wooden mills here and there dotting the chequered plain around,' the significance of which was so pointedly alluded to in the last despatch of your Excellency's predecessor—(N.B. this is the report of the Lieutenant-Governor to his superior, the Governor of Antigua)—has risen a step higher, and we now see him becoming the lessee of large sugar plantations, regularly established with all the usual appliances."

The last Blue-book tells us that Reform Bills have been passed in Dominica, "for regulating and amending the elective franchise," "for taking a register of voters," and for "amending the constitution of the colony;" all of which have received the Queen's approval. It adds, "The behaviour of the bulk of the people is worthy of mention, as having been peaceable and admirable in every respect, when there was no little temptation to indulge in vulgar and fruitless demonstrations which so often prevail when large constitutional measures are under discussion."

In Nevis President Runbold reports, "There seems to be at work an industrious spirit of improvement; cultivation seems to be carefully attended to."

In St. Kitts, last year's Blue-book says, "It is probable that the crop of last year is the largest which the island ever yielded since it was planted. I regret to say that, owing to the drought, unprecedented, except in one case, in the memory of man, the crop of the present year will not amount to much more than 6,000 hogsheads. Even this quantity, however, shows the great improvement which has taken place in the agriculture of the island of late years. I am informed that when a similar drought occurred many years ago, a single small vessel took away all the sugar produced in the most fertile part of the island."

"Tortola, under slavery, exported 15,559 cwt. of sugar. It now exports none at all. But the change is wholly an advantage. The island is singularly suitable for the raising of stock, and accordingly all the people, with few exceptions, are owners of cattle, of which they dispose to great advantage."

In Tobago "the labourers are described as well behaved and industrious."



For other proofs of the same nature we must again refer our readers to the article from which most, although by no means the whole, of those we have given have been taken. We may be asked why we have left Jamaica out of our account. The reason is plain. While we write, we are in hourly expectation of the Report of the Royal Commissioners sent to inquire into the particulars and the causes of the miserable tragedy of last winter. That report, we trust, will throw much light upon the whole state of society in Jamaica, as well as upon the details of the late outbreak and the proceedings which followed it. We therefore postpone all reference to recent events. To some statements about the state of things in Jamaica sixteen years back we shall have occasion to refer.

Mr. Baker, of course, is not bound to believe the evidence we have already quoted, and which might be extended to a much larger amount. We infer from several passages that he has never been in the West Indies. Still, if he thinks he knows more about them than men who have specially devoted their attention to their past history and present condition; and in particular more than the whole series of Governors who have resided on them during the last five-and-thirty years, he has a full right to his opinion. Let him evolve (*more Germanico*) out of his "internal consciousness," a detailed account of what the emancipated slaves of the West Indies must necessarily be and do, taking for his data what he saw of the negro savage in central Africa. We shall only remark that he himself might think it a little queer, if a West Indian Governor, founding his opinion upon his own experience of negroes in Barbadoes, should positively contradict his statements as to what he saw upon the shores of the Albert Nyanza. Still he will have a right to his theory. But he has no right to do what he has done: which is simply to pass over without notice all the evidence which exists upon the subject, and to assert, without any attempt at proof, as if it were a fact admitted by all men alike: "In this state of slavery the negro was compelled to work. He was suddenly freed; and from that moment he refused to work." "As the negro was originally imported as a labourer and now refuses to labour, it is self-evident he is a lamentable failure." The fact we believe to be that he really thought it was a matter on which all men were agreed. The assumption is made commonly enough in English society, chiefly, we believe, upon the authority of the *Times*, which systematically asserts it as an unquestioned fact, that the West Indian colonies were flourishing up to the time of emancipation; that we sacrificed their prosperity to a sentimental horror of slavery; that ever since emancipation they have been ra-

VOL. VII.—NO. XIII. [*New Series.*]

pidly declining, simply because the negroes refuse to work; that the negroes themselves have during these thirty years been growing daily more and more barbarous and wretched; that their present condition is tenfold worse, in all respects, than it was under slavery; and that the only hope of any good for them, or any prosperity for the West Indies, is in a system in which they shall be compelled to work by coercive laws. That this is a fair account of the opinions represented by the *Times* on the subject of the negroes of the West Indies will be questioned by none of its readers, hardly we think by the writers themselves. The greater part of the London papers follow suit. For instance, as soon as a report reached England last November that an insurrection had taken place in Jamaica, and before it was even pretended that anything more than this had been reported, the mass of the London newspapers rushed to the conclusion that it was a negro conspiracy "for the gratification of revenge, rapine, and lust" (we quote the words of the *Times*); and proceeded to enlarge upon the imaginary fact that wages were far higher in Jamaica than in England, and work abundant; and that if the negroes were in any distress it was only because they preferred starvation to work.

This notion about the enormous and exorbitant wages demanded by the Jamaica negroes has been founded chiefly upon a well known paper of Carlyle, published some twenty years back, in which he describes the Jamaica negro as "sunk up to the ears in pumpkin, imbibing saccharine juices, and much at his ease in creation, and saying, 'Higher wages, Massa; higher, still higher,' till no conceivable opulence of cane crop will cover such wages." Mr. Carlyle does not think it necessary to state what these wages were or what the price of living. Upon these subjects we would refer the reader to a little book, called "Jamaica in 1850, by John Bigelow." The author is an intelligent American (we believe the same now Minister of the United States at Paris); he devotes a chapter to "Labour and Wages," and shows in detail, first, that the prices of all the necessities of life in Jamaica were very considerably higher than in England. For instance:—butter, 1s. 6½d. a pound; cow's milk, 9½d. a quart; goat's milk, 1s. ½d.; American cheese, 1s. ½d.; English cheese, 1s. 7d.; potatoes, 3½d. a pound; eggs, 3½d. a couple (and during the Christmas holidays 2½d. a piece); flour, from 68s. to 72s. 6d. a barrel. Next, that wages were never more and often less than six shillings a week, the labourer finding board and lodging. He justly infers that upon such wages life could not be supported in Jamaica. Meanwhile, land was abundant and at low prices.

He ascertained that the number of black proprietors (in 1850 be it remembered) was already "considerably over 100,000, and constantly increasing;" that of these "seven-tenths had been born in slavery and had spent many years of their lives in bondage;" he adds:—

"Upon their little tracts they raise, not only what they require for their own consumption, but a surplus which they take to market, usually in small panniers, upon donkeys, or upon their heads. Nearly every coloured proprietor has a donkey, which costs from seven to ten pounds, upon which he packs his produce, and under the custody, sometimes of a woman, often of a child, he sends it to town to be converted into money, with which he purchases such articles of necessity or luxury as his land does not produce, and he can afford. One of the most interesting spectacles to be witnessed about Kingston is presented on the high road, through which the market people, with their donkeys, in the cool of the morning, pour into the city from the back country. They form an almost uninterrupted procession four or five miles in length, and what strikes the eye of an American at once is their perfect freedom from care. Of course it requires no little self-denial and energy for a negro, upon the wages now paid in Jamaica, to lay up enough with which to purchase one of these properties; but if he does get one, he never parts with it, except for a larger or better. The planters call them lazy for indulging in this feeling of independence."

Mr. Carlyle wrote, near twenty years ago, "Pumpkins are not the sole pre-requisite for human well-being." "Many other things grow among these islands useful to man, such as sugar, coffee, cinnamon, and precious spices, things far nobler than pumpkins, and leading towards commerce, arts, politics, and social developments, which alone are the noble product, where men (and not pigs and pumpkins) are the parties concerned;" and then went on:—"Quashee, if he will not help in bringing out the spices, will get himself made a slave again (which state will be a little less ugly than his present one), and with beneficent whip, since other methods avail not, will be compelled to work." It is to be regretted that Mr. Carlyle does not sometimes ask himself whether the power of expressing himself in forcible language is a sufficient substitute for taking a little trouble to acquaint himself with the subject of which he speaks. Much as he reviles "shams," he is here the basest of shams himself. The whole question depends simply on facts, and he lays down the law in complete ignorance and defiance of facts which he might easily have learned. He calls for a "beneficent whip" for his fellow men

solely because he prefers to save himself the trouble of ascertaining facts, and guesses them, when with a little trouble he might learn them. The fact was that when he wrote (our readers will observe that we say nothing of late events or their causes) a Jamaica negro could earn a great deal more by labouring on a small plot of his own than by working for wages. We are far from considering this a good and satisfactory state of things. For many reasons we should have preferred the opposite. But a thoroughly bad social system which the Jamaica negro did not cause and could not cure, made it, in fact, impossible. A wise legislature would have adopted measures by which capital would have been attracted to the cultivation of the soil. It would then have paid better to the large proprietor to give a high price for good labour rather than a very low price for bad labour; the character of the labour to be had would gradually have improved. Such changes require time; for God has so made the world and the nature of man, that, in any nation and under any clime, those who have once got into a bad social system find it very hard to get out of it, and can succeed only by degrees. But it will only make bad worse to cut the matter short, as Mr. Carlyle proposed, by restoring slavery and "the beneficent whip" as the stimulus to labour, instead of wages—an idea which Mr. Baker expresses in milder words (meaning, in fact, the same), when he says the negro "must be compelled to work by some stringent law against vagrancy."

Mr. Baker may, perhaps, plead that the facts are notorious. The slave colonies were flourishing, and their prosperity was sacrificed by the emancipation of the negro. If by "notorious" he means only that the assertion is commonly repeated, what he says is true—in any other sense it is simply false.

The simple fact is that, even in an economical point of view, as a question of mere money, the abolition of slavery was no loss, but a gain to the colonies. To some of the colonies the abolition of the African slave-trade was a great loss. But the slave-trade no one in England now defends. Where the quantity of rich virgin soil at the disposal of the planter is practically unlimited, slavery fed by an active slave-trade does pay; because it pays to take in new soil by slave labour, to exhaust the soil, and work out the slaves by a rough and prodigal method of cultivation; and, when both are exhausted, to abandon the old plantation, and take in new lands by the labour of new slaves. Except under these conditions, slave labour does not pay. But there were some British colonies, especially Trinidad and British Guiana, in which this was actually going on before the abolition of the

slave-trade, and might have been continued on a large scale if the slave-trade had not been abolished. In the great majority of the West India Islands, on the other hand, the whole soil, or, at least, all that was suited for sugar cultivation, was under cultivation before the abolition of the slave-trade. If the slave-trade had not been abolished, and if the old system had been continued, by which the colonies had the monopoly of the British market (foreign sugars being excluded), and were forbidden to trade with other countries, the result would have been, that sugar cultivation by slave labour would have been enormously developed in Guiana and Trinidad, and that those colonies would have prospered greatly at the expense of a terrible amount of oppression and national guilt. The older colonies, such as Barbadoes, would have suffered severely from the competition, because they had no means of transferring the cultivation to new and unexhausted lands. The total pecuniary result, therefore, of the abolition of the slave-trade was that the nation, as a whole, sacrificed a good deal, while, of the colonies, some gained by abolition, and others lost a degree of prosperity they would otherwise have obtained.

But the slave-trade no one now defends; and given the abolition of the trade, it is certain that all the colonies gained by the abolition of slavery. We are still speaking merely of the money question. Mr. Baker is pleased to say: "In his state of slavery, the negro was compelled to work, and through his labour every country prospered where he had been introduced." The fact is, that if we take any one date before the abolition of slavery, we shall find that complaints of distress among the West Indian proprietors were as prevalent as they have been since. Let us give one quotation:—

"Lord Chandos, in 1830, presented a petition from the West India merchants and planters, setting forth 'the extreme distress under which they labour,' and he declared in his speech, that it was 'not possible for them to bear up against such a pressure any longer.' 'They are reduced to a state in which they are obliged earnestly to solicit relief from Parliament.' Mr. Bright said, 'The distress of the West India colonial body is unparalleled in any country. Many families who formerly lived in comparative affluence are reduced to absolute penury.' The *West India Reporter* also quotes a report on the commercial state of the West Indies, which said, 'There are the strongest concurrent testimonies and proofs that unless some speedy and efficient measures of relief are adopted, the ruin of a great number of the planters must inevitably very soon take place.' Meanwhile, production was

decreasing as well. Thus in five years, ending with 1820, the exports of sugar from Jamaica had been 585,172 hogsheads, but had fallen to 493,784 in the five years ending with 1830—a decrease of no less than 91,388 hogsheads. Nay, in the ten years ending with 1830, the decrease was no less than 201,843 hogsheads from the amount in the ten years ending with 1820.” (Bigelow’s Jamaica, Appendix.)

“Another fact plainly shows that these distresses would only have grown deeper and heavier had slavery been allowed to go on. In the Dutch colony of Surinam, the very same ruin has come which befel our own islands. The fact that slavery was left standing, has made not the least difference. Here we have a large colony, with slavery preserved in all its force and beauty [this was written in 1859, slavery in the Dutch colonies was not abolished till 1864]. And what is the result? The result is almost total ruin, ‘out of 917 plantations, 636 have been totally abandoned. Of the remainder, 65 grow nothing but wood and provisions. And the small balance are stated to be on the road to destruction.’” That such was the fact is certain, why it was so we have not here space to discuss. We will only say, that all political economists are agreed that, under ordinary circumstances, slave labour does not pay. There is no one fact which a long experience more uncontrovertibly proves.

But even if this had not been the case; if down to 1833 the slave colonies had uniformly flourished, it would be equally certain that the abolition of slavery alone delivered them from a future ruin which was hastily coming upon them. The worst effect that Mr. Carlyle, Mr. Baker, or the *Times* supposes to have resulted from the abolition of slavery is that labour is scarce and dear. Any how, this would be better than having no labourers at all; and to this the old system of slavery was rapidly bringing the West India colonies. Mr. Carlyle himself must admit that a dead negro will not produce even as much as a pumpkin. Now under the old system, the labouring population of the West Indian colonies was swiftly dying out. This had been known long before the abolition of the slave-trade, but the diminution of numbers was then met by a large importation. Mr. Bryan Edwards, the most approved historian of the West Indies, discusses the comparative economy of supplying an estate with labour by keeping up the old stock, and by working it off and importing a new one. He says the diminution varies exactly with the quantity of sugar produced. After the slave-trade was abolished, importation was at an end. And then the numbers decreased so rapidly that before very many years



the only alternative would have been either to restore the slave-trade, or to abandon the cultivation of the islands.

"It was not by stories of atrocious cruelty that the eyes of Parliament were opened to the wickedness and folly of slavery. If any of our readers will turn to the pages of Hansard, they will find that what gave the death-blow to slavery, in the minds of English statesmen, was the population returns; which showed the fact, the 'appalling fact,' that although only eleven out of the eighteen islands had sent these in, yet in those eleven islands the slaves had decreased, in twelve years, by no less than 60,219; namely, from 558,194 to 497,975. The decrease by manumission is not included in this number. Had similar returns been made from the other seven colonies (including Mauritius, Antigua, Barbadoes, and Grenada), the decrease must have been little, if at all, under 100,000. Now, it was plain to every one that if this were really so, the system could not last. The driest economist would allow, that it would not pay to let the working classes be slaughtered. To work the labouring men in our West Indies to death, might bring in a good return for a while, but could not be a profitable enterprise in the long run. Accordingly this was the main, we had almost said the only, topic of the debates on slavery in 1831 and 1832. Is slavery causing a general massacre of the working classes in our sugar islands, or is it not, was a question worth debating in the pounds, shillings, and pence view, as well as in the moral one. And debated it was long and fiercely. The result was the full establishment of the dreadful fact. The slaves, as Mr. Marryatt said [he had long been the leader of the advocates of slavery], were 'dying like rotten sheep'" (*Edinburgh*, p. 428).

Hence the common assertion, that we sacrificed the prosperity of the sugar colonies to our humanity to the negro, is simply false and nonsensical. Unless we had been prepared to restore the slave-trade the sugar colonies would many years before this have been utterly ruined by the natural working of the system of slavery. If we had restored it, we should have confirmed the ruin of the older colonies and have built a bloodstained commercial prosperity in some of the new ones.

Let us say, in passing, that this wretched fact of the speedy destruction of the slave population in the West Indies is a remarkable contrast to what took place in the slave States of the American Union. The reason of the difference was twofold. First, in the United States the mass of the slaveholders were proprietors resident upon their own estates. The great

mass of the West Indian properties were held by proprietors resident in England, and were managed by overseers. "Monk" Lewis has recorded his horror when he visited his own Jamaica estates, fully believing that the negroes were well treated, and found that what at first sight had appeared to him to be "a perfect paradise" was really "a hell upon earth." He says, "If I had not come to Jamaica myself, in all probability I should never have had the most distant idea how abominably the poor creatures had been ill used." He soon discovered, however, that they were not worse used than those of his neighbours. The owners, no doubt, gave strong and positive orders that the slaves should be kindly treated. But they were often embarrassed, and, whether they were or not, they expected and required that their estates should pay as well as those of their neighbours. Mr. Helps points out that the early governors of the Spanish possessions in America were placed in a difficulty. The Royal government sent out the most stringent orders that all possible care should be taken of the natives,—and that more gold should be sent to Spain. The result was that in a very few years the island of Hayti, which Columbus had found swarming with prosperous inhabitants, had not one single native left. The overseers of West Indian estates were much in the same predicament, and the same result was rapidly drawing nearer and nearer. Again, the number of slaves in the United States was kept up, because in Virginia and Kentucky, slaves were bred for exportation to the cotton and sugar States of the South. On the sugar plantations of Louisiana the decrease of the slaves was very considerable, and was made up only by this domestic slave-trade.

As things were then, the abolition of slavery alone saved the slave colonies from utter ruin. That it was abolished suddenly was not the fault of those who appealed to the English people against the system. They were anxious that the abolition should be gradual, and their desire was thwarted by the infatuation of the planters themselves. Sudden as it was, it no doubt produced, like other sudden changes, much immediate confusion and difficulty. But all accounts agree that this difficulty had been surmounted, and that prosperity had returned before the dreadful period of West Indian distress, which we all remember, and which the *Times* and those who adopt their views from it, now represent as the result of emancipation.

The real cause of that distress was the throwing open the sugar-trade of Great Britain to the produce of the whole world. We are not saying that this was wrong, or that the

principle of free-trade is not sound. But it was impossible that its application should not produce wide-spread ruin in the West Indies. It would be highly unwise and unjust to pass a law obliging London to buy only the coals of one proprietor, say of Earl Vane. But no doubt if such a law had existed for years, its repeal would be a grievous loss to the earl. Now, for centuries, the West Indian colonies had had an absolute monopoly of the British market. The free trade policy of 1847 not only took away this, but admitted the competition of countries in which sugar was produced by slave-labour, fed by the slave-trade; and exactly under those circumstances in which, as we have already seen, slavery and the slave-trade combined are profitable; because they had a supply of fertile uncultivated lands virtually unlimited. What wonder that the West Indian proprietors suffered a grievous blow! "West Indian sugar, which in 1840 (exclusive of duty) sold in bond for 49s., had sunk in 1848 to 23s. 5d., a fall of twenty-five shillings and sevenpence out of forty-nine shillings! or to take a wide area, sugar in the eight years ending with 1846, had averaged (exclusive of duty) 37s. 3d. per cwt. In the eight following years it averaged only 24s. 6d. per cwt. From the same return it also appears, that during the first twenty years of the century, sugar fetched 48s., all but double its price from 1846-55. No wonder West Indian property has fallen in value since these good old times. And mark the consequence.

"In the eight years ending with 1846, the whole production of the West Indies was just twenty million cwt. In the eight years following it had increased by four millions and a half cwt. Now, had this sold at the previous price, it would have fetched nearly fifteen millions and a half more than it actually did fetch. Whereas in reality it sold for *seven* millions less than the smaller crop of the first period had sold for. By a fall of price from 37s. 3d. to 24s. 6d., not only was the profit on the sugar swept clean away, but a dead loss ensued wherever a loose system of mismanagement by agents, instead of proprietors, existed, and where a heavy interest on mortgages had to be paid. This heavy fall in price is a fact which demands the most emphatic notice, if we would understand the reason why the West Indies passed through the valley of the shadow of death during these years."

Mr. Bigelow, in his book entitled "*Jamaica in 1850*," devotes several chapters (page 70 to 112) to the causes of the decline of that island. He maintains that the measures of the British Government "did not cause, but only precipitated a result which was inevitable." We have not space to go

through his arguments, which seem to us to make out his case. It was a case like that of the Irish proprietors about the same time. A severe blow, under which any set of men would have reeled, found them wholly unprepared to resist. They fell, and great was the fall.

But this ruin, lamentable as it was, had really nothing to do with the supposed indolence of the negro. If the climate had been suitable to English labourers, and if the West Indies had been cultivated by the best labourers England could supply, great suffering must have resulted from the causes which we have traced. We think, therefore, that we have fully answered the practical argument, that, (let ingenious men argue as they may,) the fact remains that the West Indies, which were once one of the most prosperous parts of the British empire, have been sunk in the deepest distress since the emancipation of the negro. The fact is, that argument is merely an example of the fallacy, *post hoc ergo propter hoc*. The result has existed, but it has been owing to wholly different causes.

We have already shown, by copious statistical extracts, that this period of distress has passed away. No system will secure uniform prosperity in a country where a drought causes the total loss of the crop. This is the case in some of the West Indian Islands, as it is also in some parts of the East Indies. The negro is no more responsible in the one case, than the Hindoo is in the other. But the recovery from a long period of distress has been so general in the islands, and has continued so long, that we may confidently say the ruin of the West Indian colonies, of which we always hear when the demerits of the negro are discussed, is a thing of the past.

The fact is, that the experience of the negro in the West Indies (lamentable as it has been in many respects), proves that he possesses a capacity for adapting himself to the laws of European civilized life, which, so far as we know, has not been found in any other savage race. Savage races have been found in almost every country in which Europeans have planted colonies. But what has been their fate? They have melted away like snow before the sun. In a very few years there will be no remains of the natives of Tasmania, an island once very fairly inhabited, and about the size of Ireland. Australia being nearly the size of all Europe, the process is, of course, slower. But we much fear it is not less sure. The Tasmanian and Australian savages were, perhaps, the lowest in all respects of any savage nations within our knowledge. But the natives of New Zealand were as decidedly the highest,

and they are quickly going in the same manner. So, again, how poor are the remains of those comparatively noble savages, the North American Indians. It is only owing to the almost unlimited extent of the backwoods to which they have been driven, that there are any remains of them at all. Other races which could not be called savages at all, have wholly disappeared before the spread of European emigration. Such has been the fate of the aborigines of all the West India Islands. Such, but for the self-devotion of the glorious Las Casas, would long ago have been the fate of the vast nations of Central and South America. It is true that these nations were swept away chiefly because Christians, in their dealings with them, forgot their Christianity. But, alas! can we say that it has been remembered in their dealings with the negro? And yet so it is that the negro maintains his place in the midst of societies of European foundation. Our kinsmen in America complain that he is irrepressible. If rough usage could have extinguished him, he would long ago have become an object of interest as a race which (in the new world at least) had passed away, and was now merely an object of curiosity, or, at the utmost, of unpractical compassion. This, of itself, shows that the negro race possesses a certain capacity of adapting itself to European civilization, which does not exist in other savage races.

We feel that the practical effect of what we have said is hardly just to Mr. Baker's book. We have devoted so great a part of our space to a protest against two short passages (which we can quite imagine that many readers may pass over without even noticing them) that we have been obliged to leave unnoticed whole chapters which we read with unalloyed pleasure and interest. The very excellence of the book compelled us to do this. In a less interesting and valuable work we might have passed over those passages with a compassionate smile; but his is sure to be so justly popular that there is danger lest his views should be received with little question. By whomsoever else they may be received, God forbid that they should spread among Catholics! Let others deny the bond of a common nature, which unites us to every son of Adam, and that far closer bond, which makes us one with all those for whom Christ died. But, even to the end of the world, His Church must and will bear witness to both, and her witness will only be the stronger and the louder when the tide of human opinion sets, as it has done of late years, in an opposite direction. It is not given to all Catholics to labour and suffer for these degraded members of the human family with the zeal of B. Peter Claver, but God forbid that there

should be any one among them who follows the fashion of the day, by admitting that they are of another nature from our own, or that the rules and principles applicable to other families of men must be laid aside with regard to them.

We have mentioned, we believe, the only blemishes in a book of which we may truly say, that according to all calculation, generations may pass before the various chances necessary to produce it may again be combined. In each there are a few men for whom adventure has charms so irresistible that they voluntarily incur perils, which nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand even of the bravest would reasonably refuse. Most of them die in some unsuccessful enterprise, which, if it had succeeded, would have been admired as heroic, but which, when it fails, is merely called mad. Hardly any survive to tell what they have heard and seen, done and suffered. What chance is there that among the small residue there should be one who excels other travellers in his power of telling the story of his past difficulties, as much as in the daring which involved him in them, and in the practical gifts which extricated him from them? And before another book like this can be given to the world, the man who unites all these rare qualities must have been preserved by a special Providence through a thousand dangers, each of which, according to all human calculation, ought to have been fatal, and from which no daring or gift could have extricated him. The outline of Mr. Baker's great geographical discovery we have described. But if he had made more, his personal adventures and his sketches of the manners of the native tribes would have placed his book in the first class of voyages and travels. Take, for instance, two descriptions of Elephant hunts (vol. i., pp. 264 and 324), and that of the Giraffes (page 340), any one of which would have made the fortune of a common book. Then we have the most curious account of the natives. They are marked by such differences, not only of manners but of form and feature, that the black skin and woolly hair seem to be the only characteristics of the negro race common to them all. In other respects many of the tribes of central Africa differ as much from the received negro type as from the European. Much may reasonably be hoped for their future, if only the country can be closed against the parties of armed Turks and Arabs who penetrate deeper and deeper year by year, spreading in one district after another, plunder, fire, and slaughter. The one object of these parties is the slave-trade. No man exceeds Mr. Baker in hatred of this infernal system. If he had spoken of slavery in America, as he has of the slave-trade on the White Nile, from practical experience, his generous



instincts would have led him, we doubt not, to detest the one as he does the other, and we should have had no cause to regret anything he would have said. He is convinced that the Nile slave-trade may easily be put down; and that if this is once effected, the country has great capacities for civilization.

He says :—

The first step necessary to the improvement of the savage tribes of the White Nile, is the annihilation of the slave-trade. Until this be effected, no legitimate commerce can be established; neither is there an opening for missionary enterprise. The country is sealed and closed against all improvement. Nothing would be easier than to suppress this infamous traffic, were the European powers in earnest. Egypt is in favour of slavery. I have never seen a government official who did not in argument uphold slavery as an institution absolutely necessary to Egypt. Thus any demonstration made against the slave-trade by the government of that country will be simply a *pro forma* movement to blind the European powers. Their eyes thus closed and the question shelved, the trade will resume its channel. . . . Stop the White Nile trade; prohibit the departure of any vessels from Khartoun for the south, and let the Egyptian government grant a concession to a company for the White Nile, subject to certain conditions and to a special supervision. There are already four steamers at Khartoun. Establish a military post of 200 men at Gondokoro; an equal number below the Shellook tribe in 13° latitude and with two steamers cruising on the river, not a slave could descend the White Nile. Should the slave-trade be suppressed, there will be a good opening for the ivory trade. The newly discovered Albert Lake opens the centre of Africa to navigation. Steamers ascend from Khartoun to Gondokoro in latitude 4.55. Seven days' march from that station the navigable portion of the Nile is reached, where vessels can ascend direct to the Albert Lake. Thus an enormous extent of country is opened to navigation, and Manchester goods and various other articles would find a ready market in exchange for ivory, at a prodigious profit, as, in that newly discovered region, ivory has merely a nominal value" (ii. 312).

We have heard the question asked what good will come of Mr. Baker's great discovery after all? We might reply what good results from any increase of human knowledge? But his discovery has an immediately practical value. We are far from certain that it will ever be turned to good account. But we are very sure it might easily be and ought to be. Unhappily the spirit of the Crusades is extinct. Else what should we all feel in reading of these great regions, now given over to bloodshed and robbery, and in which wrong seems permanently to have taken the place of right, and violence the place of law? And yet, so far as appears, it would need only a slight exertion of the will of Christendom to restore them at once to peace and order. In the really remarkable characteristics of

these lands, as exhibited by Mr. Baker, is, that supreme as wrong and violence is, it is really even there utterly weak. It fell in his case merely before the resolute will of one English man and one English woman. If any one Christian Government were to organize a small body of negro troops, (whose health would not suffer from the climate,) and without assuming any direct sovereignty, were to declare, that slave-trading and war between the different tribes must and shall at once stop, and that differences between chiefs and tribes must be brought for arbitration to his representative, peace would at once be restored. A great part of the country is naturally rich, and if any kind of property were secure in it, would at once become prosperous. One thing only prevents the immediate accomplishment of this great object—the mutual jealousies of the European nations and governments. That jealousy is not without just ground. If, for instance, France were to take possession of the White Nile, England would fear for India. One mode only is conceivable by which this difficulty might be met, a sort of international commission; an interference by united Christendom to be authorised to govern that land in the name of all the Christian nations of Europe. And one person there is upon earth who could, without injury to any one else, preside over such an undertaking—the Vicar of Christ. Is our age so far unchristianized by the great schism, as to render this blessed and unbloody crusade actually impossible?

---

ART. VIII.—DR. PUSEY ON MARIAN DEVOTION.

*An Eirenicon.* By REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D. Oxford: Parker.

HOWEVER the Eirenicon controversy may terminate in the case of Dr. Pusey himself—and we sincerely hope and pray it may issue in his conversion—it will have indubitably much promoted the advancement of English Catholicism. This it will have done in two different ways. For, firstly, the mind of Englishmen is ordinarily prejudiced against Catholic doctrine and practice by a vast amount of vague disgust, of which one cannot attempt the removal, because it assumes no definite shape whatever; whereas Dr. Pusey has given to this disgust a distinct and articulate expression, so that the Catholic can fairly encounter it. Then, secondly, English-

men, with all their supposed love of fair play, are the most bigoted of men whenever the Church is in question ; and under ordinary circumstances they simply refuse to see or to hear whatever is advanced in her favour : but the interest excited by the Eirenicon may possibly just for the moment give Catholics a chance of being listened to.

We will take advantage, then, of this favourable juncture, in regard to the chief topic which the Eirenicon treats. Whether you look at Dr. Pusey himself, or at the great mass of religiously-minded Protestant Englishmen, the one prejudice, which more than all others put together exasperates them against the Church, is the worship of our Blessed Lady therein prevalent.\* So far as this prejudice is founded on true zeal for her Son's honour, no Catholic can regard it otherwise than with heartfelt sympathy. There is no Catholic but will be forward to admit, that if Marian worship tended in any way to interfere with the worship of Almighty God, it could not have His sanction ; and, consequently, that a society which inculcates it could not be the Catholic Church. We agree with Dr. Pusey, then, from the very bottom of our heart, on the matter of principle ; but he and we are wide as the poles asunder on the matter of fact. We speak of Marian devotions even as wearing that extreme shape in which he himself exhibits them, so far as he cites authorized and approved writers. Of these devotions it is little to say that they in no way *impede* the love of God and of Jesus Christ ; we maintain confidently that they *promote* that love in a most singular and special degree. On many grounds we deplore, for his own sake, his dislike of these devotions ; but on no ground more strongly

---

\* We do not see why we should avoid this most serviceable word "worship," for which it is very difficult to find a substitute. Canon Oakeley most truly remarks : "A great part of the objection to the language of Catholic devotion arises from the practice of confining certain words to their conventional sense, instead of interpreting them according to the intention of the writer or speaker ; or, on the other hand, of restricting to a secondary and technical use those which are employed in a more general sense. Thus there is really no difference in fact between the terms 'worship' and 'veneration ;' yet, while mere human qualities are popularly considered to warrant veneration, Catholics are charged with idolatry who speak of the Blessed Virgin as an object of worship ; a charge the more impertinent when we remember that in the words of the marriage rite, common to Catholics with Protestants, this term is actually employed in the sense of 'service' or 'devotion.' The word 'adoration,' again, has come to be restricted, like that of 'prayer,' to the homage claimed by God Only ; though the first, according to its etymology, need mean no more than 'invocation,' and the second, though refused to the saints, is used without scruple in petitions to Parliament. All such words mean only what they are meant to imply. They are to be interpreted by our intention, and not our intention by them" (p. 74).

than because, by not practising them, he loses so inestimable a help towards genuine love of God. This is the very reason why the thought of abandoning them is so intolerable to the Catholic, who is attracted towards them by the Holy Ghost. For the sake of peace, of charity, of unity, he might cheerfully waive any mere matter of personal taste or liking; but he cannot waive what is so indissolubly bound up with the great end for which he was created.

Two lines of objection, essentially different in kind, are urged by the Protestant world against these devotions: the one, historical and theological; the other, moral and spiritual. On the one hand, it is alleged that there is no evidence on which to rest them in Scripture and Antiquity; on the other hand, that they obscure the thought of God and tend to idolatry. Dr. Pusey, like other pious Protestants, very rightly lays far greater stress on the latter than on the former allegation; and it will be our one purpose in this article seriously to consider it. The historical and theological difficulty we reserve for consideration in our next number. And to that future article we of course defer whatever it is necessary to say, on the doctrines of the Immaculate Conception and of the Assumption; because no one can think that these doctrines in themselves have any tendency to generate idolatry. It is on the vitally important question, then, just stated—the supposed tendency of Catholic Marianism to produce a quasi-idolatry and obscure the thought of God—that we now proceed to enlarge.

All devotion, let it be observed, presupposes doctrine. Thus the mere fact of Catholics praying at all to our Lady, implies the *doctrine* that she can hear their prayers. If I pray her that she will be close at hand whenever temptation assails me,—I imply the *doctrine* that she is well aware of the fact, whenever one of her votaries is *assailed* by temptation. Again, if I beseech her to suggest those thoughts which may be most salutary under my present interior condition, I imply three different *doctrines*: viz., (1) that she has a real power (direct or indirect) of suggesting thoughts; (2) that she knows my present interior condition; and (3) that she knows what thoughts are most salutary for me *in* that condition. Indeed, every devout Catholic feels that if such belief in our Lady's power did not exist as a foundation, the whole fabric of his devotion to her would collapse and fall. Our defence, therefore, of Marian devotion must be a defence of Marian doctrine.

Now the various doctrines, indiscriminately assailed by Dr. Pusey, belong to very different classes. The first and most important consists of those, which are magisterially, and therefore infallibly, taught by the Church. How does she

thus magisterially teach them? By the fact that Pope and bishops throughout Christendom promote, encourage, nay inculcate, a devotion—and, further, that successive Pontiffs have most richly indulgenced it—which implies and presupposes the doctrines in question. In our last number we drew out a list of such doctrines; and as that list still seems to us sufficiently complete, we cannot do better than reprint the paragraph.

In order to appreciate Dr. Pusey's various propositions, it is very important that we briefly and generally explain, what are those doctrines concerning her, which we maintain to be authoritatively, and therefore infallibly, taught by the Church. They are, we think, such as these:—(1.) That her merits are incomparably greater than those of any other created person.\* (2.) That, accordingly, she occupies a place in heaven incomparably nearer to her Son than any other. (3.) That she is intimately acquainted with the thoughts, the character, the circumstances, of all who invoke her aid; and well knows what is really for their greatest good. (4.) That she has incomparably greater power than any other created person, towards promoting that good. (5.) That to unite ourselves with Mary in the contemplation of Jesus, as is done *e. g.* by those who duly recite the Rosary, is a singularly efficacious means for vividly apprehending His Divine Personality and His various mysteries. (6.) That the unremitting and most loving thought of her has an efficacy, peculiarly its own, in promoting a tender and practical love of Him. (7.) That that temper of mind is most acceptable to Almighty God, in which the thought of Jesus and of Mary is inseparably blended. (8.) That regular and repeated prayer to her cannot be omitted by a Catholic, without putting his salvation into grievous peril.† Other propositions might be added to these; and the proof which we would allege, of such propositions being really contained in the Church's authoritative teaching, is this:—If any one of them were denied, the exhortations impressed on Catholics throughout Christendom, with full approbation of Pope and bishops, would be baseless and indefensible; influential religious habits, whose growth is sedulously fostered by ecclesiastical authority, would be founded on a delusion; the Church would have in fact made a mistake, unspeakably serious, in that very matter—the training of souls for heaven—which is the one ultimate end for which she was endowed with infallibility (pp. 434-5).

In further illustration of the Church's teaching, we will insert, almost at random, various extracts from the "*Raccolta*," so admirably translated by F. St. John of the Birmingham

\* "Our God Himself loves thee [Mary] alone more than all men and angels together."—(*Raccolta*, p. 185.)

† "O Mary. . . . I shall assuredly be lost if I abandon thee. . . . It is impossible for that man to perish who faithfully recommends himself to thee."—(*Raccolta*, p. 184.)

Oratory. There cannot be more unimpeachable proofs of the Church's doctrine, than those various prayers which she authoritatively recommends to her children by indulgencing their use.

When at length my hour is come, then do thou, Mary, *my hope*, be thyself my aid in those great troubles wherewith my soul will be encompassed. *Strengthen me*, that I may not despair when the enemy sets my sins before my face. Obtain for me at that moment grace to *invoke thee often*, so that I may breathe forth my spirit with *thine own sweet name* and that of *thy most holy Son upon my lips* (p. 183).

*In thee let the Holy Church find safe shelter* ; protect it, and be its sweet asylum, its tower of strength, impregnable against every inroad of its enemies. Be thou *the road leading to Jesus*; be thou *the channel whereby we receive all graces needful for our salvation*. Be thou our help in need, our comfort in trouble, our strength in temptation, our refuge in persecution, our aid in all dangers ; but especially in the last struggle of our life, at the moment of our death, when all hell shall be unchained against us to snatch away our souls,—in that dread moment, that hour so terrible, whereon our eternity depends, ah, yes, most tender Virgin, do thou, then, make us feel how great is the sweetness of thy Mother's Heart, and the power of thy might with the Heart of Jesus, by opening for us a safe refuge in the very fount of mercy itself, that so one day we too may join with thee in Paradise in praising that same Heart of Jesus for ever and for ever (p. 179).

I would I had a greater love, a more tender love : this thou must gain for me, since *to love thee is a great mark of predestination*, and a grace which God grants to those who shall be saved (p. 185).

Thou, Mary, art *the stewardess of every grace which God vouchsafes to give us sinners*, and therefore did He make thee so mighty, rich, and kind, that thou mightest succour us. I will that I may be saved : in thy hands I place my eternal salvation, to thee I consign my soul. I will be associated with those who are thy special servants ; reject me not. *Thou goest up and down seeking the wretched to console them*. Cast not away, then, a wretched sinner who has recourse to thee. Speak for me, Mary ; thy Son grants what thou askest (pp. 186-7).

My Queen ! my Mother ! *I give thee all myself* ; and to show my devotion to thee, *I consecrate to thee this day my eyes, ears, mouth, heart, myself wholly, and without reserve*. Wherefore, O loving Mother, as I am thine own, keep me, defend me, as *thy property, and thy own possession*.

#### *Ejaculation in any Temptation.*

My Queen, my Mother ! remember I am thine own.

Keep me, defend me, as thy property, thy own possession (p. 197).

Accept what we offer, grant us what we ask, *pardon us what we fear* ; for *thou art the sole hope of sinners*. Through thee we hope for the forgiveness



of our faults; and in thee, most blessed one, is the hope of our reward. Holy Mary, succour the wretched, help the faint-hearted, comfort the sorrowful, pray for the people, shield the clergy, intercede for the devout female sex, let all feel thy help who celebrate thy holy commemoration. *Be thou at hand, ready to aid our prayers, when we pray; and return to us laden with the answers we desire.* Make it thy care, blessed one, to intercede ever for the people of God—thou who didst deserve to bear the Redeemer of the world, who liveth and reigneth for ever and ever (p. 199).

O Joseph, help us with thy prayers to be of the number of those who, *by the merits of Jesus and his Virgin Mother*, shall be partakers of the resurrection to glory (pp. 274-5).

O Joseph, obtain for us, that, *being entirely devoted to the service of Jesus and Mary*, we may live and die for them alone (p. 275).

O Joseph, obtain for us, that, having our hearts freed from idle fears, we may enjoy the peace of a tranquil conscience, *dwelling safely with Jesus and Mary, and dying at last in their arms* (p. 275).

Let it be clearly understood, then, that in this particular part of our article we are not occupied with defending the truly beautiful sentiments, which Dr. Pusey has brought together from S. Alphonsus; from S. Bernardine of Sienna; from the Ven. Grignon de Montfort. On *their* defence we shall enter afterwards; and shall face distinctly the whole mass of testimony, adduced in the Eirenicon from Catholic writers. Here, however, we speak of doctrines, not merely permitted and sanctioned by the Church, but authoritatively inculcated on all her children.

Now as to these doctrines, our opponent may reasonably require due evidence for their truth, antecedently to bringing against them any objection whatever; for a doctrine is not established, nor even made probable, by the mere circumstance that it is unobjectionable. Such evidence, however, we consider ourselves to have most abundantly supplied in our two last numbers. We assumed merely that Christianity is of divine origin, and that the New Testament narrative is substantially true. We argued in January that, if this be once granted, it follows that the Roman Catholic Church is indubitably infallible; (see particularly p. 237;) and we argued in April (pp. 422-5) that this infallibility resides primarily in her *magisterium*. We confidently maintain that no conclusion, resting on historical grounds and claiming moral not mathematical certainty, was ever more absolutely irrefragable, than the conclusion at which we arrived in those two articles. That conclusion is, that if Christianity is really of divine origin, and if the New Testament narrative is accurate as to

its general substance, then the Roman Catholic Church is infallible in her magisterium. But Dr. Pusey will be the very last man to deny, that she does magisterially teach such doctrines as those above recited, and others of a similar character. Since, therefore, she magisterially teaches these doctrines,—and since she is *infallible* in her magisterium,—it follows that these doctrines are infallibly true.

However, their argumentative establishment does not exempt a controversialist from the obligation of answering objections. Even in the region of pure mathematics a thesis would be left in a most unsatisfactory state, although it had been proved by rigorous demonstration, if a plausible objection against its truth were to remain unanswered. And much more, of course, does this hold, where the proof does not pretend to be demonstrative in the strictest sense of that word; even though it be (what in this case it is) as cogent and conclusive as any historical proof can possibly be. Now (as has been already observed) there are two kinds of objections, essentially different, which have been raised against the body of doctrine now in question. Those objections, which refer to its supposed inconsistency with Scripture and Antiquity, will be considered in our next number; those which rest on its alleged tendency to obscure the thought of God and to promote a quasi-idolatry, must be encountered here.

We will begin with considering an argument, which is often used by Protestants and even by Tractarians, though Dr. Pusey does not himself endorse it. "By the very fact that Catholics believe our Lady to hear their prayer and to read their heart, they represent her," so runs the argument, "as omnipresent and as a kind of goddess." There is no more amazing fact in all controversy, than that any Christian, who believes in the Incarnation, should have laid stress on a fallacy so easily and so triumphantly refuted. Consider that dear soul of our Blessed Lord, which was created for the very purpose of suffering in our behalf, and which did in fact experience anguish so unspeakable. When our Lord was enduring His agony, or was hanging on the cross, or now that He is in heaven,—does any Christian doubt that His soul did and does read the heart of those who address Him? that it did and does apprehend most accurately men's interior circumstances? that it did and does know what is the fittest and most appropriate remedy for their interior evils? Yet, do Christians, therefore, regard that soul as omnipresent? as uncreated? as infinite? How readily Protestants take up a weapon

against the Church, which recoils on themselves with effect the most fatal !

We will not, however, be contented with stating this parallel negatively ; we will draw it out in a positive shape. How do Protestants explain this vast knowledge possessed by the soul of Christ ? We are not aware of any explanation, except that given by Catholic theologians. That soul, say these theologians, was endued from the very beginning of its existence with three kinds of knowledge : the chief of them being "*scientia beata* ;" that knowledge which arises from the facial vision of God. In Christ's case,—these theologians proceed,—this facial vision imparted and imparts, not the habitual knowledge only, but the constant and explicit thought, of all things past, present, and future ; of the most hidden thoughts of the heart, no less than of the most visible and palpable phenomena of the universe. Such then is the account, we suppose, given by all those Protestants who give any at all, of Christ's human knowledge. But now consider. This facial vision of God was enjoyed by Mary from the moment of her death, quite as truly, though of course by no means in the same degree, as by Christ Himself. We are very far indeed from saying that the knowledge which she thus obtains is co-extensive with the human knowledge of Christ ; to suppose so, would be a monstrous and intolerable error. But we do say that, even if it *had* been thus co-extensive, she would not on that account have ceased to be a creature ; unless, indeed, you would sanction the heretical and even absurd proposition, that the soul of Christ was raised from the sphere of createdness and finiteness to that of infinity and omnipresence.

We have been answering the objection, that to regard our Lady as reading the heart, is logically and philosophically equivalent with regarding her as omnipresent. Some Protestants, however, candidly waive this objection, and admit that a Catholic does not speculatively view her as infinite : yet they urge at the same time that such is his *practical* impression ; that the interior acts of reverence and homage, with which he approaches her, are undistinguishable in kind from those with which he approaches Almighty God. Dr. Pusey is as far from sympathizing with this view as with the former ; \* and, indeed, his line of objection directly contradicts it, as will be immediately seen. We will not then say more about it in this

---

\* Some words of his indeed, in p. 184, seem at first sight to express this view ; but if you take them in connection with the pages which precede and follow, you will see that their sense is different. These preceding pages will be immediately quoted at length in our text.

place, as it will be implicitly encountered by our subsequent remarks.

In no other part of the Eirenicon can we find so clear a statement of Dr. Pusey's own objection, as in the following; which, as will be seen, contains an admission, that Roman Catholics do not in fact pay her divine worship. We have substituted our own italics for his.

This question of reliance upon the Blessed Virgin as *the* being in whose hands our salvation is virtually to be placed, is quite distinct from *that other question of the nature of the worship paid to her*. The one is a practical question affecting our whole eternity, "What shall I do to be saved?" *The practical answer to the Roman Catholic seems to me to be, "Go to Mary, and you will be saved;"* in our dear Lord's own words, it is, "Come unto Me;" in our own belief it is, "Go to Jesus, and you will be saved."

The answer which is commonly made, that devotion to the Blessed Virgin is but relative, does not touch this. *No one would impute to the Marian writers that they mean that she is Dea*, although notoriously, some of them have called her so.\* But they speak of what comes to the same, of her "delegated omnipotency;" and a recent writer says, "When Mary, in her office of Advocate, is named 'Omnipotency kneeling,' or 'interceding Omnipotency,' this will now, I hope, appear to be saying not too much but too little." *The human mind is narrow, and easily filled with one thought, especially when that thought relates to one's all*. When, then, the soul is taught that devotion to Mary is essential; that she is "the nearest to us, and the most suited to our capacity;" that "to go to Jesus, we must go to Mary; she is our Mediatrix of intercession;" that she repels none; "she is good and tender; she has nothing in her austere and repulsive;" *it seems inconceivable that many should not stop short in her, with, at best, a more or less indistinct reference to Jesus* (pp. 181-3).

In order that we may bring the argument between Dr. Pusey and ourselves to a more definite issue, we will disentangle this passage from all reference to individual writers; and we will express in our own words, to the best of our power, the argument intended by our author.

"Man's mind," we understand Dr. Pusey to say, "is narrow; his affections easily exhausted; his very time limited. I do not here speak of saintly men; and God forbid I should

---

\* What "Marian" ever called her so? What right has Dr. Pusey to make so startling a statement, without adducing any kind of authority? Curiously enough, we believe that such a phrase, used figuratively of course, does occur in the "Christus Patiens," a poem of the *patristic* period. But what *later* Catholic writer has so spoken? We ask for information: we cannot, of course, assert confidently the negative, but we have never met with any such expression.

"suggest that these men take from the Son any portion  
 "of the love which they give to the Mother.\* But I speak of  
 "the mass as we find them; of those who fulfil their religious  
 "duties in an ordinary and quiet way. These men give a  
 "certain portion of each day to prayer; and it is arithmeti-  
 "cally evident, that if some of that portion goes to Mary, there  
 "will be so much the less left for their God and Saviour.  
 "But this is far from the worst. It is quite indefinitely  
 "pleasanter and easier to fallen man that he shall address a  
 "fellow-creature, than that he shall adore the Infinite Creator.  
 "If Catholics, then, are told that she knows their thoughts  
 "and can grant their petitions, they will be ever increasing  
 "the time devoted to her, at the expense of that devoted to  
 "God. They will thus more and more learn practically to  
 "look to *her* for pardon, for help, for strength, for consolation.  
 "It is their prayer to *her* which will issue freely and warmly  
 "from the heart; while their addresses to God will be little  
 "more than the perfunctory and external performance of a  
 "certain stated and prescribed routine."

Such representations as these—and they are common from  
 the most "high-church" Protestants—tend to make a Catholic  
 wring his hands in perplexity and distress. Oh, Dr. Pusey, if you  
 could see for one moment into the heart of an ordinarily devout  
 Catholic, you would see how wild and absolutely imaginary is  
 the picture you draw of him. But how can we persuade you  
 of this? How are we to answer, in a way that shall carry con-  
 viction to your mind, those ingenious sophisms which you have  
 so perversely constructed? It is like labouring to teach a blind  
 man the true nature of colours.

Yet a certain severity of comment is surely not out of place.  
 If a blind man grieves over his calamity, how sincerely we  
 commiserate him! how earnestly we try to help him! But  
 what if he will not admit himself to be in a position of disad-  
 vantage at all? What if he declares that all who profess the  
 possession of eyesight are in a conspiracy to deceive him?  
 What if he maintains that in fact there is no such thing as  
 colour? This is the true parallel to Dr. Pusey. He has  
 never experienced, or come near to experiencing, the state of  
 mind engendered by a constant and loving devotion to Mary;  
 and yet he confidently pits his *à priori* augury of what that  
 state of mind must be, against the unanimous testimony of  
 those who *know* that phenomenon on which he descants in  
 ignorance.

---

\* See Dr. Pusey's most honourable admission of this, cited in our last  
 number (p. 439).

Our wish, however, is not to convict Dr. Pusey, but to convince him; and we may possibly succeed in this, if we can but turn the tables on himself. We will suppose then (what is at least imaginable), a pious and devout Theist, who labours under a blind prejudice against the doctrine of the Incarnation, not dissimilar to that which influences Dr. Pusey against the Church's Marian teaching. He may be supposed to express himself in such terms as these:—

“Men were created for one end—the knowledge and love of God. They better fulfil that end, therefore,—they are more perfect of their kind,—in proportion as they more constantly keep the thought of God before them; contemplate His excellences; labour to fulfil His commands. Now this sad doctrine of the Incarnation presents one constant impediment in the way of man's great work. When we Deists are oppressed with trial, temptation, suffering, we stimulate our confidence in the Almighty Creator, by steadily fixing our thoughts on His Infinite Mercy and His Infinite Power. But you Trinitarians, I have repeatedly observed, shrink from this: it is not once in a thousand times that your pious affections take any such turn. No: You fix your thoughts, not on the Infinite Love which is entertained for you by God; but on the finite love which (as you think) is entertained for you by that created soul, which you believe God to have assumed: and you ponder accordingly on the various most touching circumstances of Christ's Life and Passion. Yet even if I were to grant your full doctrine, it would still remain true that the love felt for you by the soul which so suffered is but a finite love. And further, since no one finite object is nearer than any other to the Infinite, it is true, in the strictest and most literal sense, that the love felt for you by the Divine Nature as far exceeds the love felt for you by the soul of Christ, as it exceeds the love you feel for each other.

“Then, we preserve untouched that most sacred truth, which your own Scriptures so prominently testify; that God Alone can read the heart: whereas you admit the soul of Christ into a participation of that incommunicable privilege, and thereby invest a finite object with the very attributes of Infinity. Or, again, suppose I would rouse myself to repentance for sin: I reflect on God's Infinite Sanctity; on the disloyal insult which I have offered to that Sanctity; and on the foul contrast between God, the great Exemplar, and myself. Now I will not say that you Trinitarians never do this; but I will confidently say that you far oftener do something else. You dwell on the anguish which you con-



"sider your sin to have inflicted on the loving Heart of your Redeemer ; or on the contrast between your sin and Christ's spotless sanctity on earth—i.e., the spotless sanctity of a created soul ; or on your ingratitude for the torments endured by that soul in your behalf ; and then you gaze with compunction on the pierced hands and feet. In fact, you carry this quasi-idolatrous principle into every detail of the interior life. You do not come, as I may say, face to face with God ; what you call the Sacred Humanity stands up as a constant barrier between Him and your soul. Nor must I fail to add, that your doctrine of the Atonement has fearfully encouraged sin, by representing pardon for the most frightful offences as so certain and so easily obtained.

"I do not here speak," he may continue to say, in closer parody of Dr. Pusey's assault on Catholics, "I do not here speak of saintly men, but of the great mass as we find them ; of those who fulfil their religious duties in a quiet and ordinary way. These men give a certain fixed portion of each day to prayer ; and it is arithmetically evident that if some of that portion goes to the created soul of Christ, so much less will be left for the Infinite God. But this is far from the worst. It is quite indefinitely easier and more pleasant to man as he is, that he shall contemplate a created object—especially one invested with the singularly pathetic and imaginative interest surrounding Christ's Life and Passion—than that he shall contemplate the Divine Nature. If men are told, therefore, that Christ's human soul knows their thoughts and can grant their petitions, they will be ever increasing the time devoted to that soul, at the expense of the time devoted directly to the Uncreated. They will thus learn practically more and more to look to the created soul of Christ for pardon, for help, for strength, for consolation ; it is their prayers to that soul which will issue freely and warmly from the heart ; while their direct addresses to the Divine Nature will be little more than the perfunctory and external performance of a certain stated and prescribed routine.

"Nor can you justly argue, in reply to all this, that you regard the soul of Christ as appertaining to a Divine Person, and that your prayers to that soul are addressed to God the Son. I do not deny that such is your *theory* ; but the simple *fact* is this. For once that your pious affections are directed to the Eternal Father, they are directed a thousand times to the Sacred Humanity. You must perforce, therefore, admit one of two alternatives, and I care not which. Either you love the Second Person of your Trinity far better than you

"love the First; or else you love the created soul far better than you love the Divine Person. In either case your doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation have introduced a shocking and most perverse corruption into your practical worship."

Under the pressure of such arguments, we think that Dr. Pusey in his turn would be disposed to wring his hands in perplexity. Great would be his distress at finding that men can argue with such perverse ingenuity, on grounds purely *à priori*, in favour of a proposition proved to be monstrously and extravagantly false by the daily experience of every Trinitarian. In fact, he would have a practical perception of the effect which is produced on the mind of Catholics, by his own criticism of *Marian* devotion. The mere expression of such distress, however, would do but little to convince his Deistic opponent; for we will not suppose that the Deist is fairer in dealing with Dr. Pusey, than is Dr. Pusey in dealing with the Roman Church. Dr. Pusey, therefore, would be obliged, if the Deist had some considerable influence, to bring out a train of argument in reply; and this argument might, perhaps, take some such shape as the subjoined. We should add that we are ourselves in complete agreement with the whole reply which here follows:—

"Man, undoubtedly, I grant you—it is the very foundation of all true religion—was created for one end, the knowledge and love of God: he is more perfect in proportion as such knowledge and love are greater—in proportion as he is more prompt to recognise and obey the Divine Will. But I cannot admit for a moment that he advances more quickly in such promptitude by contemplating exclusively the Divine Nature, than by contemplating the Sacred Humanity. Facts, indeed, prove most emphatically the reverse. Nor is it at all difficult to explain these facts. When an ordinary French or Italian Catholic\* contemplates the acts of Christ, he contemplates them, not simply as the acts of a finite soul, but as human acts of the Infinite God. This will be evident to any one brought into contact with the Catholics of those countries, by the awe and lowly reverence which they exhibit in pondering on the various mysteries of Christ. In like manner—that I may notice your other objec-

---

\*. We here violate dramatic appropriateness; for Dr. Pusey would assuredly say in preference, "an ordinary member of the Anglican Church." We cannot admit, however, that members of the Anglican Church, other than extreme Tractarians, do in general practically hold and realize our Lord's Divine Personality. On this we speak later in our article.

" tions—our thought of the anguish which our sin inflicted on  
 " His Heart causes us, not to forget, but on the contrary far more  
 " vividly to remember, that abhorrence of sin which charac-  
 " terizes the Divine Nature. Again, our firm belief that the  
 " most hidden secrets of our mind are open to the human soul  
 " of Christ, does but intensify our realization of the doctrine  
 " that God's Uncreated Nature is strictly Omniscient.

" Further, consider the close connection which exists  
 " between what are called respectively 'sensible' and 'solid'  
 " piety. By the former I mean the assemblage of those  
 " various *emotions*—awe, gratitude, hope, joy, tender love—  
 " which are produced by thinking on the Objects of faith; by  
 " the latter phrase, 'solid piety,' is meant a ready promptitude  
 " of *will* towards the love and service of God. Now, of saintly  
 " men great marvels are recorded, concerning the devotedness  
 " of will and purpose maintained by them under afflicting  
 " aridity; but, as regards the great mass of mankind, it is  
 " impossible to exaggerate the importance of *sensible* piety, as  
 " fostering true devotion of *the will* to God. In all human  
 " matters you would admit this. Suppose I felt no sensible  
 " pain in hearing my mother foully slandered, nor any  
 " sensible pleasure in fulfilling her wishes; you would take for  
 " granted that I am not the man to put forth any wonderfully  
 " strong efforts of *will* and active exertion, whether to please  
 " her or to vindicate her good name. From the absence, I  
 " say, of strong *emotion*, you would at once infer that vigorous  
 " acts of the *will* are also absent. And, in like manner, surely  
 " the cases are most rare and exceptional, in which there is a  
 " hearty zeal of *will* for God's glory, and a hearty love of *will*  
 " for His adorable Sanctity, without corresponding *emotions* of  
 " zeal and of love. Emotions have no merit in themselves,  
 " doubtless; but their value is simply inappreciable, as  
 " ministers and promoters of that which is valuable and  
 " meritorious. Sensible pleasure, when intense, penetrates  
 " the intellect with an unspeakably vivid apprehension of its  
 " object, and thus leads to the highest and choicest acts of the  
 " will.\*

---

\* This truth is beautifully stated in F. Faber's "Growth in Holiness." Study the chapter from page 422 to 451, and observe especially the following passage. "[During periods of sensible devotion], all trains of thought which concern heavenly things display a copiousness and exuberance which they never had before. Meditations are fluent and abundant. The virtues no longer bring forth their actions in pain and travail, but with facility and abundance, and their offspring are rich, beautiful, and heroic. There are provinces of temptations always in discontented and smouldering rebellion. But [now] we have a power over them, which is new and which is growing.

"This being understood, you should at once admit the inappreciable advantage obtained for us by our belief in the Incarnation. It is the very ground of your adverse argument, that the thought of Christ's Life and Passion, in their touching and unapproachable circumstances, is immeasurably more attractive to the imagination and affections of ordinary men, than is any contemplation of God's Infinite Nature. Since, therefore, so immeasurably more of *sensible* piety is engendered by the former than by the latter, far more of *solid* piety will also be thus engendered. Moreover, nothing can be more extravagantly contrary to facts, than to say that the habit of praying to Christ renders men's addresses to the Infinite God perfunctory and lifeless. The very opposite is well known to all devout Trinitarians. After having pondered on some mystery of our Lord's Life or Passion, we find an altogether fresh and indefinitely increased tenderness in our thought of the Invisible God. It is hardly an exaggeration, indeed, to say that, for all our tenderness in the latter, we are exclusively indebted to the former. And lastly, in proportion as our explicit prayers are more lively and heartfelt, in that proportion we more fully consecrate our whole lives to God, by keeping His remembrance in our mind throughout the day. The regular practice, then, of prayer to the soul of Christ and to God Incarnate (for these two prayers, indeed, are substantially the same) is the one cause to which we are almost exclusively indebted, for our habits (whatever they may be) of Divine love.

"As to the argument by which you finally clinch your reasoning, I totally deny your assumed premiss; I totally deny that that Object which I most love is necessarily that on which my pious affections most readily and spontaneously rest. Human nature, being weak and corrupt, shrinks from that which requires great effort and exertion. Nothing then is more easily explicable, than that at some given

---

We have such a facility in difficulties as almost to change the character of the spiritual life; and a union of body and spirit, which is as great a revolution as agreement and peace in a divided household. All these blessings are the mutations of the Right Hand of the Most High. Even to beginners, God often vouchsafes to give them, not merely as sugar-plums to children, as some writers have strangely said, but to do a real work in their souls, and enable them to hold their way through the supernatural difficulties proper to their state. But proficients should ardently desire them, for they fatten prayer; and the perfect can never do without them, as they can never cease augmenting their virtues and rendering the exercise of them pleasant" (pp. 428-9).

"moment my thoughts fix themselves with immeasurably greater readiness and spontaneousness on an object—such as the soul of Christ—which is far more level to my capacities of apprehension: certain though I am that—so far as it *can* be considered separately from Him Whose soul it is—I love it appreciatively with an affection, not merely less in degree, but quite lower in kind, than that which I entertain towards the Infinite God.

"And is not all which I have said borne out by an experience, which I may really call visible and palpable? Is it not visibly and palpably the fact, that a love of God has been called into existence among Christian Saints, indefinitely higher than that exhibited by the great servants of God under the old dispensation? nay, and different (one may really say) *in kind* from any shown in the Christian period, whether by Unitarians or by other disbelievers in the Incarnation?"

Such a reply may fail to convince Dr. Pusey's opponent; but he will himself admit its force, and that is all we desire. We say, then, that the above argument may be paralleled, in every essential particular, for the defence of Marian devotion; that the same line of thought, which vindicates against Deists the worship of Jesus, vindicates no less triumphantly against Anglicans the worship of Mary. To this critical part of our reasoning we now proceed: but, before considering those particular Catholics to whom Dr. Pusey's objections apply, it will be well briefly to touch other classes, which have a real existence and must not be forgotten. These classes, of course, melt into each other gradually and imperceptibly, so far as individuals are concerned; or the same man may fall from one class into a lower, and afterwards rise again. Still, on the whole, these various classes stand each on its distinct ground.

Protestants assure us, *e.g.*, that Italian brigands, who never think for a moment of God and their eternal destiny, often retain the habit of invoking the Mother of God; nay, of praying her to assist them in their nefarious schemes. We never could see what on earth this fact has to do with the question. So far from the Church being responsible for these men, they have broken off all connection with her; and they know very well that every priest in Christendom considers their course of life simply detestable. All we have to say then is that, scoundrel for scoundrel—if brigands there must be—we would rather that a scoundrel retained habits of prayer to our Lady, than that there should be no link whatever between him and Christianity.

Another class consists of those whom the Ven. Grignon de Montfort calls "presumptuous devotees;" and who differ from those just mentioned in this respect, that they are really anxious about their salvation, and flatter themselves that they shall obtain it. We cannot better depict and estimate these men than in Montfort's very words:—

Presumptuous devotees are sinners abandoned to their passions, or lovers of the world, who, under the fair name of Christians and clients of our Blessed Lady, conceal pride, avarice, impurity, drunkenness, anger, swearing, detraction, injustice, or some other sin. They sleep in peace in the midst of their bad habits, without doing any violence to themselves to correct their faults, *under the pretext that they are devout to the Blessed Virgin*. They promise themselves that God will pardon them; that they will not be allowed to die without confession; and that they will not be lost eternally; because they say the rosary, because they fast on Saturdays, because they belong to the confraternity of the Holy Rosary, or wear the scapular, or are enrolled in other congregations, or wear the little habit or little chain of our Lady. They will not believe us when we tell them that their devotion is only an illusion of the devil, and a pernicious presumption likely to destroy their souls. They say that God is good and merciful; that He has not made us to condemn us everlastingly; that no man is without sin; that they shall not die without confession; that one good Peccavi at the hour of death is enough; that they are devout to our Lady; that they wear the scapular; and that they say daily, without reproach or vanity, seven Paters and Aves in her honour; and that they sometimes say the rosary and the office of our Lady, besides fasting and other things. To give authority to all this, and to blind themselves still further, they quote certain stories, which they have heard or read—it does not matter to them whether they be true or false,—relating how people have died in mortal sin without confession; and then, because in their lifetime they sometimes said some prayers, or went through some practices of devotion to our Lady, how they have been raised to life again, in order to go to confession, or their soul been miraculously retained in their bodies till confession; or how they have obtained from God at the moment of death contrition and pardon of their sins, and so have been saved; and that they themselves expect similar favours. *Nothing in Christianity is more detestable than this diabolical presumption*. For how can we say truly that we love and honour our Blessed Lady, when by our sins we are pitilessly piercing, wounding, crucifying, and outraging Jesus Christ her Son? If Mary laid down a law to herself, to save by her mercy this sort of people, she would be authorizing crime, and assisting to crucify and outrage her Son. Who would dare to think such a thought as that?

I say, that thus to abuse devotion to our Lady, which, after devotion to our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament, is the holiest and solidest of all devotions, *is to be guilty of a horrible sacrilege*, which, after the sacrilege of an unworthy Communion, is the greatest and the least pardonable of all sacrileges (pp. 66-8).



The superstition here condemned is truly deplorable and detestable. How widely it may extend, we have no means of certainly knowing; but Canon Oakeley tells us that he has never met with a single case of it:—

It may be taken as an undoubted fact, that devotion to the Blessed Virgin is never an insulated manifestation of Catholic piety. Where Catholics are not devout to our Lord, they are not devout to His Mother, and *vice versâ*; but I have never happened to meet with an instance of extraordinary devotion to the Blessed Virgin, without a corresponding expansion of piety in other directions. I know it is commonly said, that the merciful attributes of the Blessed Virgin are made by uninstructed Catholics an excuse for the commission of sin. I will not go so far as to plead my own limited experience against an equally authentic testimony in favour of such an abuse; nor, indeed, were it clearly shown to exist, would it prove anything more than a new illustration of the poet's words, that 'Noblest things find vilest using.' Yet I will say, upon the word of a priest and confessor of nearly seventeen years' standing, that I have never met with a case of the kind. I have always found, on the contrary, that one of the first symptoms of spiritual decline is the decay of devotion to the Blessed Virgin; and that they who realize enough of her office to know that she is our true Mother of Mercy cannot, if they would, divest themselves of the salutary impression, that she is also the purest of God's creatures, and that, as such, she is abhorrent of sin in all its forms (pp. 29-30).

"Of course," he adds, "there is always a danger that sinners will be tempted to lay too great a stress on the merciful aspects of religion;" but this arises, not from any peculiar characteristic of Marian devotion, but from the corruption and sluggishness of human nature. Indeed, if on account of such abuses we may condemn Marianism itself, a similar condemnation must fall very far more heavily on two doctrines still more primary and fundamental: viz. the Atonement of Christ and Justification by faith. For no perversion of Marian doctrine can be named, which will bear even a moment's comparison with the disgusting and appalling assemblage of blasphemy, which has been built by Antinomians on those two vital truths of the Gospel.

A third class consists of men, who are plunged indeed in mortal sin, and who will not bring themselves to go through that amount of prayer and effort which would lead without delay to their justification, yet who sincerely wish they led a better life; who feel keenly the peril and the misery of their state; while they cherish, however, the hope that their Heavenly Mother will obtain for them such more powerful grace, as may carry them with far greater ease to genuine repentance. These men instinctively shrink from the explicit

thought of God and of Christ, through their consciousness of sin and their fear of judgment to come; but this fear does not keep them back from her, to whom (as Catholics love to express it) Christ has committed the kingdom of mercy, while reserving to Himself that of justice. Now as to such sinners every Catholic, of course, holds, (1) that if they die in their present condition they will be inevitably lost; (2) that the very fact of their remaining unreconciled to God involves the greatest danger, lest they fall frequently into fresh mortal sins; and (3) that the very delay of repentance becomes a mortal sin under certain circumstances, as, *e. g.*, when the Church's precept urges of confession and communion. But such comments are beside the point. The question is simply this: other things remaining the same, is it or is it not beneficial, that they shall be frequent in prayer to the Blessed Virgin? Now, most evidently, it is inestimably beneficial. If they practised no prayer to her, they would not be one whit more frequent in prayer to God; but on the contrary would give themselves up without reserve to the world and the devil. Nor have we any doubt whatever, that in numberless cases Mary draws such men, by her intercession with God, to true and efficacious attrition; and that thus multitudes are saved, who, but for their invocation of her sweet name, would have miserably perished.

We now come to that particular class which Dr. Pusey's argument concerns: the class of men who are free from mortal sin, and firmly resolved by God's grace not to commit it; but who are not as yet what is commonly called "interior:" who are not as yet labouring systematically to discover and correct their venial sins and imperfections, and to raise their thoughts and affections from earth to heaven. Of such men we maintain that a solid and earnest devotion to our Lady is the most hopeful means they can adopt, for being raised by God into a higher state of mind. We must beg our readers to look back at p. 150, and refresh their memory as to Dr. Pusey's general ground of objection; because it is in answering such objection, that the reason for our own positive doctrine will most clearly appear. Our reply, it will be observed, preserves throughout a close parallel with that, by which we suppose Dr. Pusey himself to have refuted those Unitarians and Deists, who may have been scandalized at his "idolatrous" worship of the Sacred Humanity. Nor can we better introduce what we would say, than by quoting F. Newman's most eloquent and touching passage, on the respective characteristics of Jesus and Mary as Objects of worship.

It was the creation of a new idea and a new sympathy, a new faith and worship, when the holy Apostles announced that God had become incarnate ; and a supreme love and devotion to Him became possible, which seemed hopeless before that revelation. But besides this, a second range of thoughts was opened on mankind, unknown before, and unlike any other, as soon as it was understood that that Incarnate God had a Mother. The second idea is perfectly distinct from the former, the one does not interfere with the other. *He is God made low, she is a woman made high* (p. 88).

He who charges us with making Mary a divinity, is thereby denying the divinity of Jesus. Such a man does not know what divinity is. *Our Lord cannot pray for us, as a creature, as Mary prays ; He cannot inspire those feelings which a creature inspires.* To her belongs, as being a creature, a natural claim on our sympathy and familiarity, in that she is nothing else than our fellow. She is our pride,—in the poet's words, "Our tainted nature's solitary boast." *We look to her without any fear, any remorse. . . .* Our heart yearns towards that pure Virgin, that gentle Mother, and our congratulations follow her, as she rises from Nazareth and Ephesus, through the choirs of angels, to her throne on high. So weak yet so strong ; so delicate, yet so glory-laden ; so modest, yet so mighty. She has sketched for us her own portrait in the Magnificat. "He hath regarded the low estate of His handmaid ; for behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. He hath put down the mighty from their seat ; and hath exalted the humble. He hath filled the hungry with good things, and the rich He hath sent empty away" (pp. 90-1).

Now we will first admit, for argument's sake, Dr. Pusey's most strange supposition, that devotion to our Lady does not ordinarily cause increase of the time given to prayer. We most cordially admit also of course his implied principle, that men are more excellent, more perfect of their kind, precisely in proportion as they grow in the knowledge and love of God. This, indeed, is the very "foundation" of S. Ignatius ; and most assuredly is very far more consistently and loudly proclaimed within the Church than in any other religious society. But we maintain, firstly, that this knowledge and love may be at certain times far more effectively promoted by prayer to Mary, than by direct prayer to God and Christ. Let us fix our ideas by an instance. A Catholic comes into a church in the middle of the day, from the dust and heat of his secular avocations. It will very often happen that, after he has genuflected before the Blessed Sacrament, his very best course for raising his heart to a fervent love of God will be prayer before an image of our Lady.

For consider. It is Dr. Pusey's own admission—nay, it is the very foundation of his whole argument—that, with ordinarily pious men, it often requires far less effort and exertion to fix their thoughts on a created person, such as Mary, than on

God Incarnate; and on such occasions, therefore, their prayer to her will be far more earnest, far less distracted, far more heartfelt, than it would have been if addressed directly to God. Now, there are two different effects to be considered in the case of prayer. On the one hand, the various graces given by God of His own good pleasure in response to it; and, on the other hand, the result it produces, in the way (as it were) of natural cause and effect,\* on the will and on the emotions. As to the former of these effects, there is no pretence for saying that prayer to Mary is less efficacious than direct prayer to Jesus; for it is ultimately addressed to Him, and that through the most acceptable of all mediators. As to the latter effect,—its quasi-natural result on the intellect, the will, the emotions—let this be borne in mind. It is a vitally important psychological fact, and one on which theologians lay the most earnest stress, that no man can desire evil for its own sake; that all men's thoughts and affections would be directed to God in one unintermittent stream, were it not for the innumerable corrupt interests and associations which enchain them. In proportion, then, as at any moment I am disentangled from these meshes, in that very proportion I am more disposed to obey God's Will and to follow His Preference. Now remember that every Catholic regards Mary as absolutely free from the slightest approach to moral imperfection of any imaginable kind; and that her contemplation, therefore, is among the most powerful correctives of every inordinate and irregular passion. But, in proportion as every inordinate and irregular passion is corrected, in that very proportion the love of God is fostered and promoted; and the love of God, therefore, instead of being impeded, is promoted with singular efficacy by prayer to the Most Holy Virgin. Since then, such prayer, under the circumstances supposed, was very far more earnest and heartfelt than any other prayer would have been;—it was, under those particular circumstances, far more conducive than any other to increased love of God. Under favourable conditions, indeed, it may so engender actual and vivid emotions of love and gratitude to God, that I can be no longer content without explicit worship of Him; that I prostrate myself before the Blessed Sacrament, and address Him (as it were) face to face; that in some sense I leave Mary for Jesus, and by so leaving her fulfil her highest wishes in my regard. As Montfort puts it, I have begun according to the Church's order with "*benedicta tu in mulieribus;*" and have been raised

---

\* For supernatural phenomena, no less than natural, have fixed mutual relations of their own.

to the still higher step, "Benedictus Fructus ventris tui Jesus."

And here we are reminded, before we go further, of dwelling on a somewhat important consideration suggested by the above argument. What is meant when one says that each different saint has a *character* of his own? S. Paul, *e. g.*, had his own very pronounced character; S. Peter his; and so of the rest. It must mean, at all events, that certain qualities very perceptibly and prominently predominated over the rest. Now does not this further imply that there was a certain want of complete harmony? a certain imperfection of temperament? On the other hand, our Saviour, as exhibited in the Gospels, has no "character;" no one quality predominates unduly over any other; he is the very image of the Infinitely Perfect God. And here we see under one aspect how broad is the contrast between devotion to Mary and to another saint. She has no special "character" of her own, any more than her Son has; she is the "Speculum Justitiæ;" the faultless mirror of complete and harmonious sanctity.

We return to our argument. There cannot possibly be a greater mistake than to suppose, as Dr. Pusey does, that, with such Catholics as we are now considering, the worship of Mary reduces the worship of God and of Jesus to a perfunctory, external, uninteresting work. The very opposite holds most emphatically and prominently. We have already given one explanation of this; here is another. Devotion to our Lady, if constant and unremitting, will assuredly issue in a loving contemplation of her history; of those mysteries (as Catholics call them), joyful, sorrowful, glorious, which are commemorated in the Rosary. Now, it has been frequently pointed out by Catholic controversialists—and it should be pondered on again and again—that there is no history of her current in the Church, except in closest connection with her Son. On the details of her life during those periods when her life was led apart from His—before the Annunciation and after the Ascension—Scripture preserves a deep silence; nor has there been any beyond the most sparing supplement of Scripture from the stores of tradition. Her joys, as contemplated by Catholics, were in His Presence; her dolours in His Passion; her exaltation in His Resurrection and Ascension. To dwell on her mysteries, is to think of Him in the most affecting and impressive way in which that thought can possibly be presented.

Then again, in proportion as I grow in love and devotion to her, I am more prompt, of course, to do her bidding and fulfil her wishes. What is that bidding? what are those wishes?

except that I obey her Son;—that I render to God that adoration which the Church prescribes. My love for her will make me earnestly desirous of doing this in the way she would have me do it; or, in other words, as a heartfelt and pious exercise.

Here, then, it will be in place to point out, how large a portion of their worship is offered directly to God, by those who follow the Church's rule, and who really seek therefore to please their Heavenly Mother. Cardinal Wiseman treated this excellently during the controversy of 1841-5.

Now, to examine this view of the case, let us take as an instance, an Italian peasant. What are the religious exercises which are enjoined him, and which he regularly attends? First, the holy sacrifice of the Mass, every Sunday and holiday, and pretty generally every morning before going to work. He knows, as well as you or I, what the Mass is, and that it cannot be offered up to any, save to God. Secondly, the Holy Communion at least several times a year; often, much more frequently. Thirdly, as a preparation for it, confession of his sins, penitently and contritely. These two sacraments he well knows have nothing to do [intrinsically] with the Blessed Mother of God. . . . Fourthly, the Benediction, or adoration of the Blessed Sacrament, generally in the evening of all festivals, and often on other days. To this we may add the forty hours' prayer, or exposition of the Blessed Sacrament for that space of time, watched by adorers day and night. Among the prayers most frequently inculcated, and publicly recited, are acts of faith, hope, charity, and contrition, and well known by the most illiterate. These leading exercises of worship and devotion all belong to God: the principal one that is referable to the Blessed Virgin is the Rosary. This generally forms a part of family evening devotions, and is moreover occasionally said in public. I would gladly enter, did my present object permit such details, into an explanation and analysis of this devotion, one of the most beautiful to my mind: at present I need only say, that every book of devotion will show you, what the catechism in Italy, and I believe in Spain, fully explains, that the mysteries of our Saviour's Birth, Death, and Triumph, are the real objects of this form of prayer. However, take it as you please; consider it as a devotion principally addressed to the Blessed Virgin, and add to it any others usually said, as her Litany;—and I ask you what do they amount to, compared with the exercises of piety which I have before enumerated, the most solemn by far and the most indispensable? For every Catholic, however ignorant, knows that he must every festival assist at Mass, under pain of sin; but none imagine that a similar penalty is attached to the neglect of any of their devotions to the Blessed Virgin. This surely forms a most important distinction between the two worships, that to God and that to the greatest of the Saints ("Letter to Rev. J. H. Newman," pp. 22-24).

A similar view is powerfully expressed by F. Newman himself, in reply to Dr. Pusey.



When strangers are so unfavourably impressed with us, because they see images of our Lady in our churches, and crowds flocking about her, they forget that there is a Presence within the sacred walls, infinitely more awful, which claims and obtains from us a worship transcendently different from any devotion we pay to her. That devotion might indeed tend to idolatry, if it were encouraged in Protestant churches, where there is nothing higher than it to attract the worshipper; but all the images that a Catholic Church ever contained, all the crucifixes at its altars brought together, do not so affect its frequenters, as the lamp which betokens the presence or absence there of the Blessed Sacrament. Is not this so certain, so notorious, that on some occasions it has been even brought as a charge against us, that we are irreverent in Church, when what seemed to the objector to be irreverence was but the necessary change of feeling, which came over those who were there, on their knowing that their Lord was away?

The mass again conveys to us the same lesson of the sovereignty of the Incarnate Son. . . . Hostile visitors enter our churches on Sunday at midday, the time of the Anglican service. They are surprised to see the high mass perhaps poorly attended, and a body of worshippers leaving the music and the mixed multitude who may be lazily fulfilling their obligation, for the silent or the informal devotions which are offered at an image of the Blessed Virgin. They may be tempted, with one of your informants, to call such a temple, not a "Jesus Church," but a "Mary Church." But, if they understood our ways, they would know that we begin the day with our Lord and then go on to His Mother. It is early in the morning that religious persons go to mass and communion. The high mass, on the other hand, is the festive celebration of the day, not the special devotional service; nor is there any reason why those who have been at a low mass already, should not at that hour proceed to ask the intercession of the Blessed Virgin for themselves and all that is dear to them.

Communion, again, which is given in the morning, is a solemn unequivocal act of faith in the Incarnate God, if any can be such. . . . I knew a lady, who on her death-bed was visited by an excellent Protestant friend. She, with great tenderness for her soul's welfare, asked her whether her prayers to the Blessed Virgin did not, at that awful hour, lead to forgetfulness of her Saviour. "Forget Him?" she replied with surprise, "Why, He has just been here." She had been receiving Him in communion (pp. 99-101).

All this, as we have said, would proceed equally on the most strange supposition, that worship of Mary is (as it were) so much arithmetically subtracted from direct worship of God; whereas we really believe that those most given to the former abound even more than others in the latter, from the increased attractiveness and joy which prayer presents to them. Man-kind, as F. Newman once said, "are feeble-minded, excitable, effeminate, wayward, irritable, changeable, miserable." Pre-eminently they are *moody*; and a religion which shall persuasively influence them, must be one effectually addressing itself to each successive mood. At one moment they will be

readily disposed to direct and immediate worship of the Creator; at another they will give themselves with far more alacrity to that direct worship of Mary, which (let it never be forgotten) is always most truly, though indirectly, the worship of God. Nor can anything (to our mind) be more mistaken, than a carefully methodical calculation as to how much time is given to one and how much to the other.\* On the contrary, the very characteristic of Catholic devotion is its *spontaneousness*. Those who once were Anglicans and are now Catholics find in no respect, we believe, a wider contrast between their present life and their past, than in this element of spontaneousness. To pace along an old-fashioned Dutch garden, divided into prim walks and parterres, and with every step marked out for you, is no doubt (so far as it goes) a healthful exercise; but it gives no invigoration to the frame and spirits, which can be compared with that accruing from the liberty to roam at will over beautiful grounds, and gaze on enchanting scenery, and cull, according to your inclination of the moment, from a variety of exquisite flowers. Could Dr. Pusey have one day's *experience* of the true religion, he would shudder at the very thought of returning to the dreary routine of his Anglican exercises.

Yet surely at last there is no need of *reasoning* at all against Dr. Pusey's allegation; seeing it is a matter of visible and palpable experience, that (if we may so parallel S. Paul's words) where worship of Mary has abounded,

---

\* "The *scrupulous* devotees are those who fear to dishonour the Son by honouring the Mother, to abase the one in elevating the other. They cannot bear that we should attribute to our Lady the most just praises which the holy Fathers have given her. *It is all they can do to endure that there should be more people before the altar of the Blessed Virgin than before the Blessed Sacrament; as if the one was contrary to the other, as if those who prayed to our Blessed Lady did not pray to Jesus Christ by her.* They are unwilling that we should speak so often of our Lady, and address ourselves to her. These are the favourite sentences constantly in their mouths: 'To what end are so many chaplets, so many confraternities, and so many external devotions to the Blessed Virgin? There is much ignorance in all this. It makes a mummery of our religion. Speak to us of those who are devout to Jesus Christ' (*yet they often name Him without uncovering*: I say this by way of parenthesis). 'We must have recourse to Jesus Christ; He is our only Mediator. We must preach Jesus Christ; this is the solid devotion.' What they say is true in a certain sense; but it is very dangerous, when, by the application they make of it, they hinder devotion to our Blessed Lady, and it is, under the pretext of a greater good, a subtle snare of the evil one. For never do we honour Jesus Christ more than when we are most honouring His Blessed Mother. Indeed we only honour Mary that we may the more perfectly honour Jesus, inasmuch as we only go to her as to the way in which we are to find the end we are seeking, which is Jesus."—(Montfort, pp. 63-4.)

there has worship of the Sacred Humanity abounded much more. It is the Roman Catholic Church which is the natural home,—as on the one hand of devotion to the Mother of God,—so on the other hand of those countless devotions—to the Passion, the Blessed Sacrament, the Sacred Heart, the Divine Infancy,—which are ever springing up in such luxuriance. On the other hand, every attempt at introducing such things in Dr. Pusey's communion is accepted by the common sense of Englishmen as an infallible indication of "Popish" proclivities. We can understand Catholic churches being called "Mary Churches" by some ignorant extern, who knows nothing about the Blessed Sacrament, and who sees a large image of our Lady surrounded by eager suppliants, to their inestimable spiritual advantage. But by what possible indication he could be led to call an Anglican edifice a "Jesus Church," it utterly bewilders us to conjecture.\* Is it in an *Anglican* edifice, then, that he would see a colossal image of Christ Crucified, and a Crucifix placed conspicuously over each one of the numerous altars? For any visible emblems exhibited, one might as well give the appellation "Jesus Church" to a Mohammedar mosque.

Dr. Pusey may reply to all this, that still those Catholics of whom we speak have more *sensible feeling* towards the Mother than towards the Son. If the fact were really so, it would present to us no kind of difficulty; as we shall immediately say: but Cardinal Wiseman, than whom no Englishman has been better acquainted with foreign Catholics,† expresses a different opinion. These are his words; and the whole passage illustrates much of what we have been saying:—

But again, I shall be told, that the manner in which the poorer Catholics pray before her images and those of the Saints, betrays a greater fervour of devotion than they display at other times; nay, that it even indicates a superstitious trust in those outward symbols themselves. This appearance may be partly true; though I am ready most completely to deny, that *half the ardour, enthusiasm, and devotion* is ever exhibited before relics or images, which you may see any day *before the Blessed Sacrament, when it is exposed to adoration*. But at the same time, I will assert that the tenderer emotions are not the proper tests of higher feelings, such as confidence, veneration,

---

\* "In southern India and Ceylon our [the Anglican] churches are called by the natives 'Jesus Churches'; the Roman Catholic Churches 'Mary Churches.'"—(*Eirenicon*, p. 107.)

† We speak of "foreign Catholics;" because Dr. Pusey, with much truth, considers that in England there is a "check from the contact with Protestants" (p. 120), which keeps back tendencies from their legitimate issue.

and homage. A child may be more fondling and affectionate with his mother, while he will more reverence, more obey, more believe, and more confide in his father. And so I conceive, that the more sensible part of devotion, that which works upon natural feelings, may be more apparently excited by the joys, the sufferings, the glories, and the virtues of beings more akin to our nature, than by contemplation of those, however much more perfect, of a Being infinitely removed from our sphere. What thought so powerful as to be able to measure the abyss of suffering which overwhelms the heart of Jesus, expiring on the cross? But what mind so dull, or what heart so callous, as not to be able to apprehend the maternal feelings of her who stands bereaved at its foot? Does not *her* grief, in fact, present us the truest and clearest mirror of *His* sufferings? Does not the *Stabat Mater*, on that very account, excite the purest sentiments of love and sorrow for the Son, because His griefs are viewed through the sympathies of the Mother ("Letter to Rev. J. H. Newman," pp. 24-25).

Sensible devotion in prayer is a phenomenon, which must always depend in great degree on accidental circumstances of time, place, health, spirits, and the like. But as regards such Catholics as we are now considering, if any general statement can truly be made, it will (we think) be such as this. Sensible devotion to the Mother of God is a good deal more readily and immediately excited than to her Son; but, on the other hand, when the latter does come into existence, it is a good deal keener and more vivid. The thanksgiving, *e. g.*, after a devout communion, will ordinarily be accompanied with feelings of far more exuberant exultation, than are any prayers to the Blessed Virgin.

However so let it be, if Dr. Pusey will, that these Catholics have more sensible devotion to Mary than to Jesus. What inference will he thence deduce? That love of Mary is to be discouraged? Take a parallel case. It will not be doubted that an ordinary Anglican has very much more tenderness of feeling towards a loved and loving mother, than towards Almighty God; that he will feel far more keenly an insult offered to her, than one equally serious offered to her Creator; that he will feel far more lively grief at having given her pain, than at having wounded his Saviour's Heart; that her company is a far more simple delight to him, than is the companionship with God in prayer. Moreover, there are some most serious texts, which might easily be so interpreted as to cause such a man serious alarm. "He who loveth father or mother more than Me, is not worthy of Me." "If any man cometh to Me and hateth not his father and mother, he cannot be My disciple." Yet Dr. Pusey would himself admit that, on the whole, this human affection is most salutary; and that it is an invaluable safeguard against much

evil. He would much wish that such a man loved God more; but most certainly he would not regard it as a step towards so desirable an end, that the earthly object were loved less tenderly. Why is it that Dr. Pusey so persistently disparages tenderness to the highest and purest of all creatures, while so tolerant of creature-love in a very far more questionable shape? Really, to read his language about Catholics, one would suppose that the great body of Anglicans exhaust the whole tenderness of their heart on Objects simply Divine; that there is among them no love of mother, of wife, of children, of friends; that their heart beats with sensible love for God, and for God Alone.

In one word, then. Those Christians, of whom we are now speaking, are in general very far more easily diverted from worldly to heavenly thoughts, and very far more rapidly raised into sensible devotion, by the contemplation of Mary than in any other way. But sensible devotion (see p. 155) is of inappreciable value in promoting solid piety; and the contemplation of Mary, by its own nature, carries men forward out of itself into contemplation of Jesus and of God. Mary, therefore, is the way to Jesus, just as Jesus is the Way to the Father.

There is also another unspeakable advantage flowing from Marian worship, totally different from any of which we have yet spoken, and on which we shall have to enlarge in our next number. Here we will but most briefly touch on it. Catholic controversialists often and (we are convinced) most justly allege, that the vast majority of Protestants possess no real practical belief and realization of our Lord's Divine Personality. How are Catholics themselves preserved from this calamity? One most special safeguard is devotion to our Lady. The habit of approaching Him through a mediatrix places Him (if we may so speak) before their mind in the *position* of the Supreme Being. The appeal to His Mother's intercession "engraves upon the imagination of the faithful" His Own Divine Personality. S. Bernardine and S. Alphonsus have borne fully as important a part as S. Athanasius and S. Cyril, in "imprinting" this doctrine "on the worship and practice of the Catholic people."

That passage from the Eirenicon which we quoted at starting is immediately succeeded by the following:—

It is difficult to see how direct heresy should not be suggested by sentences such as these (and they are so common): "If we fear to go directly to Jesus Christ our God, whether because of His Infinite Greatness, or because of our vileness, or because of our sins, let us boldly implore the aid of Mary our Mother. *She* [Dr. Pusey's italics] is so charitable that she repels none of

those who ask for her intercession, no matter how great sinners they have been ; for, as the saints say, never has it been heard, since the world was the world, that any one has confidently and perseveringly had recourse to our Blessed Lady and yet has been repelled." For, for this argument to have any force, it must be implied to be possible that any could "confidently and perseveringly have recourse to our Divine Lord and yet be repelled," which is, of course, directly against the Gospel (pp. 183-4).

Now suppose an Anglican were to speak as follows :—"If we fear to go directly to the Invisible God, whether because "of His Infinite Greatness, or because of our vileness, or because of our sins, let us boldly appeal to that soul which so tenderly loved us ; which suffered for us anguish unspeakable ; whose greatest grief of all was, that so few would avail themselves of His Redemption. That soul so loves us that it repels none, no matter how great sinners they may have been ; for never has it been heard, since the world was the world, that any one who confidently and perseveringly prayed to Jesus has been repelled." Beyond all possibility of doubt, if it were true that the Catholic exhortation quoted by Dr. Pusey involves heresy, it would be no less true that this Anglican exhortation involves heresy far fouler. It is very intolerable, we admit, to say that the love felt for us by Mary exceeds that felt for us by the soul of Christ ; but it is immeasurably more horrible and monstrous to say, that the finite love felt for us by this latter exceeds the Infinite Love of the Eternal God. Dr. Pusey, however, would not misunderstand his co-religionist, in the perverse way in which he misunderstands the Catholic Church. He would at once understand his meaning to be, not that the love felt for us by Christ's soul exceeds that felt for us by the Divine Nature ; but, that when men are bowed down by a sense of sin, it is very far more easy for them to realize the former than the latter. Precisely similar is Montfort's meaning in the passage cited by Dr. Pusey. Moreover, it is important to remark that Dr. Pusey—without in any way indicating the omission—has actually dropped two sentences from the centre of that passage ; *which sentences shew it unmistakably to the sense we have just given.* We put these two sentences into italics :—

If we fear to go directly to Jesus Christ our God, whether because of His infinite greatness, or because of our vileness, or because of our sins, let us boldly implore the aid and intercession of Mary our Mother. *She is good, she is tender, she has nothing in her austere or repulsive, nothing too sublime and too brilliant. In seeing her, we see our pure nature. She is not the sun, who, by the vivacity of his rays, blinds us because of our weakness ; but she is fair and gentle as the moon, which receives the light of the sun, and tempers it to render it more suitable to our capacity. She is so charitable that she*



repels none of those who ask her intercession, no matter how great sinners they have been; for, as the saints say, never has it been heard since the world was the world, that any one has confidently and perseveringly had recourse to our Blessed Lady, and yet has been repelled (pp. 57-58).

The contrast drawn by the saintly writer is not, you see, between Jesus and Mary as regards their power and their willingness to help us; but between the degree of readiness which men, keenly conscious of sin, naturally experience towards addressing one or the other. We must really maintain against Dr. Pusey that, though Montfort's expression of this thought is very beautiful, the thought itself is among the most obvious of truisms.

"It is, of course, an abuse of" Roman "teaching," elsewhere admits Dr. Pusey, "when any confine their prayers to the Blessed Virgin." But he adds, "a certain proportion, it has been ascertained by those who have inquired, do stop short in her" (p. 107). It is simply impossible, we reply, that any Catholic can "confine his prayers to" her, and "stop short in her," without falling into what the Church teaches to be mortal sin. Is he never then to make theological acts? never to prepare himself for confession? never to receive communion? Or—putting aside the question of mortal sin—do these Marian devotees carefully avoid all visits to the Blessed Sacrament? to the Forty Hours' Exposition? to the solemnity of Benediction? "It has been ascertained" forsooth! by whom? when? where? how?

The author characteristically proceeds in one sentence, from a fact about which he can know nothing whatever, to a fact within his own personal cognizance; as though the two were equally undoubted.

I have myself been asked by Roman Catholics to pray for my conversion: once only I was asked to pray our Lord. On the other occasions, I was exclusively asked to pray the Blessed Virgin for it (pp. 107-8).

Dr. Pusey himself very probably, if he were organizing prayers for some object he had closely at heart, would choose prominently prayers addressed to the Sacred Humanity. We should not on that account suspect him of the heretical tenet, that the soul of Christ possesses either a power or a will to help us, commensurable with the Divine Power and Will. But we should understand him to see, that prayer to the Sacred Humanity is prayer to the Divine Person clothed in that Humanity; while it is far more attractive and easy for ordinary men, than prayer to the Invisible God.\* So prayer to Mary (as we have already explained) is virtually and ultimately prayer

to God, while it is often more easy and attractive for ordinary men in their ordinary moments. "She is not the sun," Montfort says, "who blinds us because of our weakness, but fair and gentle as the moon and more suitable therefore to our capacity."

We believe we have now gone through all Dr. Pusey's important objections against the worship of Mary, as practised by that class of Catholics to which those objections mainly refer. We will add a few words, however, on two further classes who remain to be considered; viz., (1) interior, and (2) saintly men. We have already said—and the argument just brought to a close vindicates, we hope, our conclusion—that no one practice is so likely to raise an ordinary Catholic into a higher spiritual condition, as the frequent and sustained worship of Mary; because this secures prayer to God, offered in the most effective way. Now, so soon as a Catholic becomes interior—so soon as he begins to labour earnestly and consistently for a withdrawal of his affections from every earthly object—he is compelled (as it were) by the very necessity of his nature, to seek rest and satisfaction in thought of the Infinite. A direct remembrance of God, therefore, becomes a far more constant phenomenon than it was at the earlier period, and pervades the whole current of his life. Let us suppose, then, that he has been happily practised from the first in lively and frequent devotion to Mary: his thoughts of the Mother and the Son now become most intimately blended; he ever contemplates the higher Object through the lower, as through a mirror; he becomes, to use Montfort's most touching expression, "the slave of Jesus in Mary." He is their slave, but their most loving slave. And so far from the latter love in any degree lessening the former,—on the contrary it singularly intensifies it, and gives to it an otherwise untasted quality of affection and tenderness. All this we here state without any attempt at proof: because our space is limited; and because Dr. Pusey (as we understand him) does not press his objections, as telling in the particular case of these higher and more advanced souls.

We will conclude, then, this particular portion of our argument, with two brief remarks closely connected with each other. They have been suggested, not by any thing which Dr. Pusey has brought forward, but by the ordinary clamour of Protestant controversialists.

(1) To speak of our Lady's mediation as encroaching ever so distantly on our Lord's mediatorial office, is to show so strangely inadequate a sense of what is included in the latter, that the very allegation confirms our worst impressions of Protestant misbelief. A year ago (July, 1865, pp. 156-7) we

expressed the confident opinion that very few in Dr. Pusey's communion, except the extreme Tractarians, in any way realize or practically hold that belief in our Lord's Divine Personality, which they speculatively accept; and we assigned, as one principal reason of this, the very circumstance of their neglecting Marian devotion. In our last number, again (p. 549), we commented on a decidedly High Church writer, who accounts it blasphemy to hold that "Mary is the Mother of the Eternal." Canon Oakeley has some excellent remarks on this in p. 75. But we will quote in preference some admirable words of F. Newman, written several years ago, which cannot be too carefully pondered:—

*Few Protestants have any real perception of the doctrine of God and man in one Person. They speak in a dreamy shadowy way of Christ's Divinity; but when their meaning is sifted, you will find them very slow to commit themselves to any statement sufficient to show that it is Catholic. They will tell you at once, that the subject is not to be inquired into, for that they cannot inquire into it at all, without being technical and subtle. Then when they comment on the Gospels, they will speak of Christ, not simply and consistently as God, but as a being made up of God and man, partly one and partly the other, or between both, or as a man inhabited by a special divine presence. Sometimes they even go on to deny that He was the Son of God in heaven, saying that He became the Son, when He was conceived of the Holy Ghost; and they are shocked, and think it a mark both of reverence and good sense to be shocked, when the Man is spoken of simply and plainly as God. They cannot bear to have it said, except as a figure or mode of speaking, that God had a human body, or that God suffered; they think that the 'Atonement,' and 'Sanctification through the Spirit,' as they speak, is the sum and substance of the Gospel, and they are shy of any dogmatic expression which goes beyond them. Such, I believe, is the character of the Protestant notions among us on the divinity of Christ, whether among members of the Anglican communion or dissenters from it, excepting a section of the former ("Discourses to Mixed Congregations," pp. 366-7).*

(2) The notion that Roman Catholics practically regard our Lady as a "goddess" is repugnant, not merely to carefully-ascertained truths, but to the most superficial phenomena. The very cause of that special attraction which her devotion possesses for the great body of Catholics, is their regarding her as a fellow-creature. She can obtain for them all they ask; while they feel that in praying to her they are not speaking (as it were) face to face with their Infinite Creator.

Hitherto, we have been defending those Marian doctrines which (as it seems to us) the Church magisterially, and there-

fore infallibly, inculcates on all her children. In April, after recounting these doctrines, we thus proceeded :—

There are other propositions which, if not actually taught by the Church with infallible authority, are yet so universally held by devout servants of Mary, that no "cordatus Catholicus" will dream of doubting them. For instance, (1) that God secured her assent as an indispensable preliminary to the Incarnation ("fiat mihi secundum verbum tuum") *which otherwise would not have been accomplished*; (2) that while our Lord was on earth, she had a clear knowledge of, and keen sympathy with, all which He effected for our salvation; (3) that she takes a most active part in dispensing the gift of perseverance; (4) that extraordinary tenderness towards her is a special note of predestination (p. 435).

Here, as before, previously to examining objections, we must consider the positive ground for accepting these four propositions. We say this, then. If a number of holy men, deeply imbued with the spirit of the Church; profoundly and largely acquainted with the text of Scripture; and specially given to a loving meditation of Mary;—if these men are unanimous in arriving at certain conclusions, and if not one such man can be named who dissents therefrom, an overpowering probability is recognized by every loyal Catholic that these propositions are true. Then, to take them severally. The Scriptural argument ordinarily adduced for the first, is excellently expressed by Canon Oakeley in p. 24. The second is almost necessarily implied in the patristic tradition, so powerfully drawn out by F. Newman, on Mary's office as the second Eve: for how could the former occupy a place in man's *redemption*, analagous to that occupied by Eve in his *fall*, unless she had a clear knowledge of, and sympathy with, the great work in progress? The third proposition has been admirably defended by F. Newman. See, *e.g.*, pp. 78-9, and again pp. 77-8. Again, in p. 111, he argues :—

Our Lord died for those heathens who did not know Him; and His Mother intercedes for those Christians who do not know her: and she intercedes according to His will; when He wills to save a particular soul, she at once prays for it (pp. 111-12).

She prays for it, because God has made it part of her sweet office, that from the first moment of her Assumption, she shall have an integral part in the salvation of each predestined soul.

We are not aware of any special objection raised by Dr. Pusey against any one of these three propositions; and we proceed, therefore, to the fourth: in regard to which our main argument must turn, neither on defending its truth, nor

replying to difficulties, but on investigating its real sense. F. Newman quotes the following words from F. Nepveu, S.J.,

The love of Jesus Christ is the most sure pledge of our future happiness, and the most infallible token of our predestination. Mercy towards the poor, devotion to the Holy Virgin, are very sensible tokens of predestination; nevertheless they are not absolutely infallible: but one cannot have a sincere and constant love of Jesus Christ, without being predestinated. . . . The destroying angel, which bereaved the houses of the Egyptians of their first-born, had respect to all the houses which were marked with the blood of the Lamb (p. 99).

F. Newman adds, "I believe it is a fair specimen of the teaching of our spiritual books." Now, there can be here no possible difference of *doctrine* between any one Catholic and any other. That if you have a sincere and genuine love of Christ, such a fact supplies immeasurably stronger ground of hope as to your salvation, than could possibly be supplied by any devotion to our Lady which is *separated* from such love,—this is a truth which no Catholic could hear questioned without horror. Yet, on the other hand, it does seem to us (but we speak quite diffidently and under correction) that it is very far more common in Catholic writers to mention "devotion to the Holy Virgin," than "the love of Jesus Christ," as a special note of predestination. For one instance out of many, F. Newman (p. 108) quotes a prayer to Mary from the *Raccolta* saying, "to love thee is a great mark of predestination:" but he quotes no such indulgenced prayer addressed to our Blessed Lord; nor are we ourselves aware of having observed one. And we suspect the reason of all this to be, that the phrase "note of predestination" is not commonly used exactly in F. Newman's sense. We give our own impression for what it may be worth; assuring Dr. Pusey, meanwhile, that as to the question of *doctrine*, no Catholic could dream of holding any other than that above stated.

Firstly, then, and as a previous illustration, consider the word "devotion." We think it is not ordinarily used, as expressing any habits of prayer which are *obligatory*; but those only to which a Catholic freely resorts, according to the instinct of his own piety. Thus, we speak of "devotion to Mary," but hardly of "devotion to Jesus." What we do speak of in regard to Him is rather "devotion to the Passion;" or "to the Sacred Heart;" or "to the Blessed Sacrament;" or "to the Holy Infancy;" or (to speak of a recent devotion which has shown itself in some parts of Catholic Christendom) "to His Holy Countenance." This proposition, then,—*"devotion to Mary is a special note of predestination,"*—shows by its very

wording that reference is not made to any matter of strict obligation.

But, further, it appears to us that those exercises which are matters of strict obligation, have a connection with predestination even closer than that of being "notes" thereof. It is not commonly said, *e.g.*, that *frequentation of the Sacraments* is "a note of predestination." Such matters would rather be called "the very *path* of predestination." That Catholic is predestined, and he only, who continues to the end in his love of God, and of Jesus Christ; and in his frequentation of the Sacraments: or who, so often as he falls therefrom, recovers himself, and dies in that state of recovery. But the question may naturally suggest itself to him, "Is my love for God and for Jesus Christ of that *kind*,—so deep, and genuine, and stable—that I have reasonable ground for hoping that it will continue? Have I any special *note* of my predestination?" And the answer given is, that if my love for Jesus is associated with a peculiar tenderness to His Blessed Mother, I have greater security than by any other assignable mark, that it will last me to the end. And, in accordance with this, the prayer to our Lady, quoted by F. Newman from the *Raccolta*, after having said, "to love thee is a great mark of predestination," proceeds, "pray that I may have a great love for Jesus;" "I covet no good of the earth, but to love my God Alone." And that, in this sense of the phrase, a heartfelt love for the Blessed Virgin is a most special note of predestination, has been established (we hope) in the earlier part of our article.

From what has here been incidentally said, we may explain an episcopal statement which Dr. Pusey has singularly misunderstood. The italics are our own:—

To judge from the official answers of the Bishops to Pius IX. in answer to his inquiry, "with what devotion your clergy and faithful people are animated towards the Conception of the Immaculate Virgin," Faber was right as to the immensely greater devotion and trust in the Blessed Virgin, at least in countries where there is no check from the contact with Protestants. Certainly the prominent impression in my mind from reading those answers (they occupy more than three close volumes) was "*if the devotion to God were like that to the Blessed Virgin, it would be a world of saints.*" "In this diocese," says the Bishop of Cochabamba, "as in the whole of civilized America, it has attained to the highest degree, so that nothing more can be desired." "Our only hope in these countries, tried by divers tribulations," says the Vicar Apostolic in Cochin China, "is placed in our most holy Mother, from whom we expect salvation [*salus*]." "The devotion of the Blessed Virgin is such as is to be defined by no bounds," says the Bishop of Scutari. In Spain and Portugal devotion to the Blessed Virgin is in its natural home. They are familiarly called Marian kingdoms (pp. 119-20).



Dr. Pusey has understood, *e.g.*, the Bishop of Cochabamba to mean, that the whole population of civilized America are faithful servants to the Mother of God. Yet surely he cannot suppose that prelate to hold, either on the one hand, that the whole population is free from mortal sin; or else, on the other hand, that men plunged in mortal sin can be faithful servants to the Mother of God. Dr. Pusey's whole misconception, we think, arises from his misunderstanding this word "devotion." A population which did not recognize our *Blessed Lord* as the legitimate Object of worship, would not be Catholic at all; but "devotion" to Mary is not of strict obligation. Yet in the countries of civilized America frequent and habitual prayer to Mary is universally recognized, as no less integral a part of religious practice, than frequent and habitual prayer to Christ. "Nothing more can be desired" in this respect; and the blessedness of such a circumstance is extremely great.

And this will be a convenient place for another episodical remark. F. Newman's Jesuit director at Rome said to him, "You cannot love Mary too much if you love our Lord a great deal more" (p. 23). On the other hand, F. Faber (we think in the "All for Jesus") speaks to this effect: "Our love of Mary may be wrong *in kind*, but cannot exceed *in degree*." There can be absolutely no difference between Catholics in their real *feeling* on this head; the only question concerns the true *analysis* of that feeling. We suggest the question in this case, for better judges than ourselves to ponder: but of the two, we rather incline to F. Faber's analysis. Let a true, not a false, image of Mary be presented by the intellect, and the will cannot by possibility be too strongly attracted to the object thus depicted.

We now proceed to various thoughts and expressions, quoted by Dr. Pusey from individual writers of greater or less weight. And these, as regards authority, are divisible into four different classes.

Firstly we have those of holy men—such as S. Alphonsus and the Venerable Grignon de Montfort,—whose works have been carefully examined by supreme authority, with a view to prospective canonization. Of these every Catholic is absolutely certain that they contain nothing contrary to faith or morals; or to the Church's common sentiment; or to the Church's common practice.\* At the same time, let it be most care-

---

\* The law is conceived in these terms . . . . If the person whose beatification is in question, has written books, "no inquiry must be proceeded with until these books have been diligently examined in the Sacred Congregation  
VOL. VII.—NO. XIII. [*New Series.*] N

fully observed, the Church has in no respect implied that the various propositions contained in these works are *true*, but only that they are neither unsound nor abnormal. If, then (as may often be the case), there is any Catholic to whom such propositions do not commend themselves as true ;—or (still more) who finds that the very thought of them perplexes and discomposes him ;—he would be exhorted by every good director to banish them from his mind. Indeed we believe, as a matter of fact, that comparatively few Catholics, either here or abroad, have ever heard of those propositions on which Dr. Pusey lays most stress ; for, as Canon Oakeley has most justly remarked, they “represent rather the shape into which men of ascetic lives and profoundly spiritual minds are accustomed to cast their thoughts, than the standard of our customary preaching or the scale of general devotion” (p. 34). At the same time it is undoubtedly the bias of our own judgment, not merely that the propositions cited by Dr. Pusey from these holy men are entirely *true*, but also that they are generally edifying ; that solid piety and love of the Incarnate God would be greatly promoted, if a far larger number of Catholics were trained really to study and appreciate these most elevated thoughts and most burning words. We shall incidentally touch on this in the sequel.

A second class of propositions cited by Dr. Pusey have been expressed century after century, in a shape substantially similar, by eminent and approved writers, and cannot possibly be unknown to Pope and bishops ; while at the same time they have never been at all discouraged, and still less visited with any kind of censure. By such significant silence, as it seems to us, the Church magisterially teaches—not indeed that they are *true* (very far from it)—but that they are not theologically unsound, nor in themselves injurious to piety.

A third class of these propositions have been expressed by this or that individual writer, and such writer may have been in general orthodox and Catholic ; yet there may be no reason whatever to think that they have been brought before the notice of ecclesiastical authority. Such propositions may imaginably be unsound or even heretical ; they carry with them no extrinsic weight ; they must stand or fall on their own merits.

Lastly, a work may have been actually condemned and

---

of Rites, to see if they contain errors against faith or good morals, or any new doctrine contrary to the Church's common sentiment or her common practice.” —(*Analecta Juris Pontificii*, tom. i., p. 737).

placed on the Index: in which case, of course, the Church will have anticipated Dr. Pusey's censure. Canon Oakeley observed in his pamphlet (p. 21, note) that no Catholic he had met with had ever heard the name of Oswald; and after this was written, Mr. Rhodes opportunely discovered that name on the Index. Now we cannot avoid speaking here of Dr. Pusey with some severity. Mr. Rhodes wrote to the *Weekly Register*, announcing what he had found; and Dr. Pusey was at that time in the habit of reading that newspaper: yet we are not aware that from that day to this he has fulfilled the obvious duty of retracting those serious charges against the Church, which he had founded on her supposed toleration of Oswald's tenets.

Now it is evidently impossible, within the limits of one article, to treat separately every single passage adduced by Dr. Pusey: but the course which we purpose to pursue, will be admitted by every one as equitable and fair. We will consider every one of those *general propositions* against which he most severely inveighs; and we will face severally every one of those *individual passages* adduced by him, which are presumably the most difficult of explanation. Firstly, then let us treat the *general propositions* which fall under Dr. Pusey's lash.

(1) We had heard before, repeatedly, that Mary was the Mediatrix with the Redeemer; some of us, who do not read Marian books, have heard now for the first time, that she was ever our "Co-Redemptress." The evidence lies, not in any insulated passage of a devotional writer . . . *but in formal answers from archbishops and bishops to the Pope* as to what they desired in regard to the declaration of the Immaculate Conception as an article of faith. Thus the Archbishop of Syracuse wrote, "Since we know certainly that she, in the fulness of time, was *Co-Redemptress of the human race*, together with her Son Jesus Christ our Lord." From North Italy the Bishop of Asti wrote of "the dogma of the singular privilege granted by the Divine Redeemer to His pure mother, the *Co-Redemptress of the world*." In south Italy the Bishop of Gallipoli wrote, "the human race whom the Son of God, from her, redeemed; whom, together with Him, *she herself co-redeemed*." The Bishop of Cariati prayed the Pope to "command all the sons of Holy Mother Church and thy own, that no one of them shall dare at any time hereafter to suspect as to the Immaculate Conception of their *Co-Redeemer*." From Sardinia the Bishop of Alghero wrote, "It is the common consent of all the faithful, and the common wish and desire of all, that our so beneficent Parent and *Co-Redeemer* should be presented by the Apostolic See with the honour of this most illustrious mystery." In Spain the Bishop of Almeria justified the attribute by appeal to the service of the Conception. "The Church, adapting to the Mother of God in the office of the Conception that text, 'Let us make a help like unto Him,' assures us of it, and confirms those most ancient traditions, 'Companion of the Redeemer,' 'Co-Redemptress,' 'Authoress of everlasting

salvation." The bishops refer to these as ancient, well-known, traditionary titles, at least in their Churches in North and South Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, Spain (pp. 151-3).

Dr. Pusey might have inserted, in further corroboration of this doctrine, the indulgenced prayer which we have already quoted, that "*by the merits of Jesus and His Virgin Mother, we may be partakers of the resurrection.*" (*Raccolta*, p. 275.) And we are the more surprised at his objection to this title of Co-Redemptress, as he has quoted from Salazar the following beautiful explanation of its purport:—

The ways in which the Blessed Virgin co-operated with Christ to the salvation of the world may be classed as three:—

1. As far as she so sacrificed herself to God for the salvation of the world by the wish and longing for death and the cross, that, if it could be, she too, for the salvation of the universe, was willing to co-die (*commori*) with her Son, and to meet a like death with Him.

2. And chiefly, whereby the Virgin gave her help to Christ for the common salvation, in that she, exhibiting a will altogether conformable and concordant with the will of Christ, gave her Son to death for the common salvation. And her zeal for the human race is not seen only therein, that it made her will conspire with the will of her Son, but also in that she excited and impelled Him to undergo death.

3. That she acted as mediatrix with the Mediator. The work of our salvation was so wrought. The Virgin expressed to her Son the wishes and desires which she had conceived for the salvation of the human race; but the Son, deferring to the Mother, received these, and again presented to the Father the desires both of His Mother and His own; but the Father granted what was wished, first to the Son, then to the Mother (p. 154).

For ourselves we are disposed to accept the whole of this as *true*; but we are here only maintaining, that it contains nothing contradictory to Christian doctrine or intrinsically dangerous. If we could only guess what is Dr. Pusey's reason for thinking otherwise, we might answer that reason; but as things are, we await his further explanation. Canon Oakeley (p. 24) excellently vindicates the title of Co-Redemptress.

The other general propositions, condemned by Dr. Pusey, undoubtedly require more careful consideration. We will next (2) consider the statement (*Eirenicon*, p. 105) that she "appeases her Son's just wrath:" whence Dr. Pusey infers that, according to Marian writers, "the saints are more ready to intercede with Jesus than Jesus with the Father;" or (in other words) that Mary loves sinners more warmly than Jesus loves them. But here, as in so many other instances, the parallel of the Incarnation is precisely in point. Dr.

Pusey may hear many Anglican preachers say that "the Father is justly irritated," and that "the Son appeases His wrath." Does he, therefore, ascribe to them the portentous heresy, that sinners are loved with less intensity by the Divine Nature than by the soul of Christ? The Incarnation displays no less truly the Father's loving-kindness than the Son's. "God *so loved the world* that He gave His only begotten Son:" "God *commends His Love*, in that Christ died for us:" and any different tenet appertains only to a Calvinistic heretic. And yet it is said with a most true *drift*, in practical and devotional writing, that the Son appeases the Father's wrath, and the like: because such phrases are understood to signify what is most true; viz., that, in consequence of the Incarnation, the Father forgives us our sins, and treats us with immeasurably greater mercy than would otherwise have been the case. It is most certain, indeed, that the love felt for men by the Father is infinitely greater than that felt for them by the soul of Christ; and in like manner that the love felt for them by the soul of Christ is very far greater, even than that felt for them by their Heavenly Mother. Still it is axiomatically evident that, if Mary's intercession has any efficacy at all, it must induce her Son to treat men more mercifully than would otherwise have been the case; and therefore, just as it is very suitably said that the Son appeases the Father's wrath, so it is said with precisely equal propriety that Mary appeases her Son's.

Under this head comes the vision of the two ladders (pp. 103-4). Let us suppose some Anglican poet to depict "a vision touching the two ladders that reached from earth to heaven: the one red, upon which the Eternal Father leaned, from which many fell backward, and could not ascend: the other white, upon which the Sacred Humanity leaned; the help whereof, such as used, were by Jesus received with a cheerful countenance, and so with facility ascended into heaven." The only unfavourable comment on this which we should expect from Dr. Pusey would be that, in saying "*many* fell backward" from the former ladder, the poet implied the existence of some who did *not* fall backward from it. Otherwise he would heartily applaud such a poem; as teaching the all-important truth, that Jesus is the one appointed Way for coming to the Father, and that those who attempt to reach the Father without that mediation will be disappointed. Such, then, is exactly the meaning of S. Alphonsus, and of those other saintly writers who have appealed to this vision. They teach that, to a Catholic, Mary is immeasurably the surest way of reaching Jesus; that those Catholics who neglect her re-

gular and habitual invocation, will find it incomparably more difficult to obtain sanctification and salvation, and will, far more commonly than not, fail in the attempt.

(3) "God retaineth justice to Himself, and granted mercy to her" (p. 105). "God has resigned into her hands (if one might say so) His Omnipotence in the sphere of grace" (p. 103). "To her He has committed the kingdom of mercy, reserving to Himself that of justice." This latter is, perhaps, the commonest shape in which the idea is expressed; but that idea is of course one and the same. Such phrases convey a meaning, either on the one hand intolerable and heretical, or on the other hand beautiful and edifying, according to the sense in which they are taken. They may *in themselves* mean, that our Lord has in such sense given to Mary the kingdom of mercy, as *to have abdicated that kingdom Himself*; that mercy and grace can no longer be obtained by addressing Him directly, but only by invoking His Mother. Such a notion, no Catholic need be told, would be nothing less than an appalling blasphemy. We need only say, therefore, that no one but an enemy ever dreamed of so understanding the statement; that those holy men who most constantly uttered it, were also foremost in inculcating those prayers, *e.g.*, to the Blessed Sacrament and the Sacred Heart, which are absolutely inconsistent with its false interpretation; and that they are even more ardent and glowing than other Catholics, in their description of those unspeakable blessings which flow from prayer offered to the Sacred Humanity. In one of Mr. Rhodes's invaluable letters he exhibits this fact in the particular instance of S. Alphonsus:—

It is the same as regards S. Alphonsus. It would, indeed, be impossible to find in all his voluminous writings a passage of such severity as the one in which Dr. Pusey quotes from M. Olier. Still in the "Glories of Mary" there occur a few quotations which speak very strongly of our Lord's office as our Judge as well as Saviour. Dr. Pusey tells his readers of these, but he does not tell them of the explanatory passages to be found in the self-same volume, *e.g.*, cap. iii., l. "The King of Heaven, being infinite goodness, desires in the highest degree to enrich us with His graces; but, because confidence is requisite on our part, and in order to increase it in us, He has given us His own Mother to be our Mother and advocate." Of this and similar passages Dr. Pusey says nothing; nor does he speak of the veritable ocean of love and confidence in our Lord, elsewhere manifested throughout the writings of this great saint, and by which the few sentences, strongly setting forth His severity to sinners, are absolutely overwhelmed. It is hopeless to attempt more than the most imperfect samples of them. Open, for instance, his Reflections on the Passion of our Lord. In the very first



chapter we find him stating that "our Lord declared to St. Gertrude that He was ready to die as many deaths as there were souls in hell if he could save them." In chapter xiv. he says, "Jesus Christ did not cease with His death to intercede for us before the Eternal Father. He still at present is our advocate : and it seems as if in heaven (as St. Paul writes) He knew no other office than that of moving His Father to show us mercy ; 'always living to intercede for us' (Heb. vii.). And, adds the Apostle, the Saviour for this end has ascended into Heaven 'that He may appear in the presence of God for us'" (Heb. ix.). And, further on, "My justice (said God to Mary Mgd. de Pazzi) is changed into clemency by the vengeance taken on the innocent flesh of Jesus Christ. The blood of this My Son does not cry to Me for vengeance, like that of Abel, but it only cries for mercy and pity, and at His voice my justice cannot but remain appeased." Again, a little further on, S. Alphonsus puts into the mouth of our Lord these tender words :—"My little lamb (*pecorella mia*), fear not ; see what thou hast cost Me ; I hold thee written in my hands in these wounds that I have borne for thee ; these ever remind me to help thee and to defend thee from thy enemies ; love me and have confidence." And the sinner answers :—"Yes, Jesus, I love you, and I confide in you. It is your will that all should be saved, and that none should perish. Even should You drive me, O my Love, from your face, I will not cease to hope in You, for You are my Saviour. I love you, O dear Jesus ; I love you, and I hope."

There remains, then, the true sense of the statement we are considering. Christ has reserved wholly to Himself the kingdom of justice ; He has given to His Mother no lot or part whatever in the office of judging and condemning. But He has so unreservedly handed over to her His whole kingdom of mercy, that she possesses (as it is often expressed) "*omnipotentia supplex*;" that the invocation of her will be fully as effective in obtaining mercy and grace, as would be prayer to Him offered with the same dispositions. To all therefore, who feel themselves bowed down by a sense of sin, she is a truly attractive object of worship : in some sense more attractive than her Son ; because her office is exclusively that of mercy, and *within* that sphere He has communicated to her His full power.

(4). "'To sinners who have lost Divine grace, there is no more sun' (the symbol of Jesus) 'for him, but the moon is still on the horizon ; let him address himself to Mary'" (p. 106). "'No sinner doth deserve that Christ should any more make intercession for him with the Father . . . and therefore it was necessary that Christ should constitute His well-beloved Mother a mediatrix between us and Him'" (p. 105). We frankly admit that we have more difficulty in seeing the precise sense of these expressions, than of any others brought against Catholics. Undoubtedly indeed, if one found

such words without any indication of authorship, one might understand them to mean, that he who has fallen into mortal sin commits grievous presumption in offering direct prayer to God; and that God would have had no power to remit mortal sin, if He had not created Mary to intercede for it. But since notoriously every Catholic in the world would regard either of these propositions with horror unspeakable—and since the words were addressed by a Catholic to Catholics—it is demonstratively certain, that neither writer nor readers understood any such blasphemy. In fact, the writer was able to use such strong language, precisely *because* no one of his readers could by possibility take his words in their literal sense. It is as though a son said to his mother, “You are the author of my being; in you is my only hope;” and Dr. Pusey forthwith pounced on him for blasphemously introducing a second Deity.

It is absolutely certain, then, that these words do not mean what Dr. Pusey supposes; but it is more difficult to say accurately what they do mean. On the whole, however, we cannot be wrong in giving some such interpretation as the following. “If you have once possessed the unspeakable blessedness of justification and adoption, and have fallen from that blessedness by deliberately outraging your Creator with mortal sin, you have nothing favourable to expect from God’s *Justice*. With no approach to injustice, God might remove you straightway from earth to hell; there is nothing bought for you by Christ in His Passion, which could preclude your Creator from so acting. You must sue, then, for favours which Christ has *not* secured for you by His Passion; you must throw yourself most unreservedly on His *Mercy*; and you have more hope of forgiveness in proportion as you more keenly realize this fact. Yet this very keenness of realization may injure you, unless you adopt the appointed remedy: your sense of the insult you have offered to God may make you feel as though there were ‘no sun in the horizon;’ may make you slow in apprehending the boundless mercy of Him who is to be your Judge. He has Himself provided for this your obvious need. He has appointed a mediatrix, who entertains for you no feeling but that of pity; and whose maternal love will strengthen and encourage you to approach her Son. Nor is this all; for her prayers have a most powerful effect in obtaining for you a far greater degree of mercy than He would otherwise have granted.”

(5). “By dying he obeyed not only His Father, but also His Mother” (p. 158). “All things are subject to the command of the Virgin, even God Himself.” “The Blessed Virgin is

superior to God, and God Himself is subject to her, in respect of the manhood which He assumed from her." "However she be subject unto God, inasmuch as she is a creature, yet she is said to be superior and placed over Him,\* inasmuch as she is His Mother." "You have over God the authority of a mother, and hence you obtain pardon for the most obdurate sinners" (p. 103, note).

Dr. Pusey is often so severe on Catholics for going beyond Scripture, that one might have expected considerable forbearance where they have but used New Testament language. S. Luke says (c. 2, v. 51), "He came to Nazareth, and was subject to them." Who was "He?" The Incarnate God. Who were "they?" Mary and Joseph. Now Dr. Pusey, in p. 103, expresses himself as though the very phrase "God is subject to Mary" were so plainly revolting, as to require no express refutation: yet it is almost word for word the Holy Ghost's statement through S. Luke. Moreover, to say that the Incarnate God was subject to Mary and Joseph, is simply and precisely saying in other words that they were "superiors" "set over" the Incarnate God. We have it, then, on the Holy Ghost's infallible authority, that for certain years the Incarnate God was subject to His Mother; that she was "superior" to Him; "set over Him;" "had over Him the authority of a mother."

There are probably many in the Church of England who, if they saw this argument of ours, would at once object, that our Lord was only placed under Mary and Joseph during His nonage, before His faculties were fully developed. But Dr. Pusey holds, of course, as strongly as we do, that from the very moment of His miraculous Conception the soul of Christ knew distinctly and explicitly every object which it knows even at this very moment. Other Protestants again are more or less consciously under the impression, that since our Lord's Ascension His Sacred Humanity has in some sense ceased to be: but Dr. Pusey here again would heartily anathematize any such heresy.

Let us begin, then, by examining what the Holy Ghost meant in S. Luke's words. This of course is certain; that at every moment there was this or that particular act, which the Eternal Father wished the soul of Christ to elicit; and also that this precise act did, in fact, always take place. One cannot suppose however, consistently with S. Luke's language (to put it on no other ground), that the commands of Mary

---

\* We assume that the Latin word is "prælatâ." Dr. Pusey translates it "preferred before Him;" but our rendering of the text is plainly more correct.

and Joseph were constantly overruled by the superior claim of God's Will; and still less can we suppose that that Will surrendered its claim to *them*. One only supposition then remains, which is unquestionably the true one. God so inspired Mary and Joseph, that whenever they commanded Jesus, such command was precisely accordant with the Divine preference: and Jesus, among the various motives which at that moment influenced His human will, vouchsafed to direct His act to this particular motive also—viz., the virtuousness of obeying His Mother; and of obeying him, too, whom God had appointed to stand in the place of an earthly father.

Now firstly we ask, what possible difficulty there can be in supposing that the same obedience was paid by Jesus to Mary's authority at a somewhat later period; viz., when He entered on His Passion? that he prepared Himself for this, by asking her permission? that "by dying He obeyed not only His Father but also His Mother?" We are not here arguing that He did so: though for ourselves we have every disposition to believe that He did so. But we ask, what possible *theological objection* can be raised against such an opinion, should it commend itself to some holy man? Canon Oakeley (pp. 24-5) points out the plain implication of Scripture that at the Annunciation "she must express her free and unbiassed consent before the human race can be redeemed in the manner fore-ordained of God:" and he then proceeds:—

Nor can I see (though I admit this to be rather the pious inference of devotion, than the logical conclusion of dogma) that any more direct share in the unapproachable office of our Redeemer is ascribed to His Blessed Mother in regarding the Passion itself as suspended upon her consent, than is implied in the intimacy thus proved by the language of Scripture itself to have existed from the first between the decrees of the most Holy Trinity and the free-will of the Blessed Virgin (p. 25).

Then, following Jesus and Mary from earth to heaven, something still surely remains in their mutual relations, not identical indeed (far from it), yet not unanalogous. Take the parallel of an absolute monarch, whose mother still lives and is fondly loved by him. He possesses over her undoubtedly supreme authority: so far from her being able in any true sense to command him, he can impose his commands on her without appeal. And yet his assent to her just petitions will not altogether resemble in kind his assent to other suppliants; he will regard her still with a real filial deference; and she will, in a figurative sense, exercise over him a certain maternal authority. This is the obvious sense of the expressions cited by Dr. Pusey. If to any Catholic such expressions appear

strained and far-fetched, he is in no way called on to adopt or even think of them. For our own part, it seems to us most touching and appropriate, that earnest devotees of Mary should delight in setting forth, exalting, amplifying, her various unapproached and singular prerogatives.

We may add here, as in the former case, that the paradoxical form itself which such expressions wear, shows clearly how far it was from the mind of their originators that they should be construed literally. In every case a Catholic in a Catholic country was addressing Catholics, who could never dream of suspecting him to mean what both he and they knew to be heretical. No one, *e. g.*, more abounds in such expressions than S. Alphonsus; and, indeed, one of Dr. Pusey's quotations is taken from him. The simplicity, then, is almost affecting with which that Saint elsewhere expresses himself.

There is no doubt (he says) that figures, like hyperboles, cannot be taxed with falsehood when *by the context of the discourse the exaggeration is evident*, as for example when S. Peter Damianus says that Mary comes to her Son, *commanding, not beseeching . . .* So then figures are permitted, *wherever there cannot be any mistake on the subject.*—(French Translation of works, vol. vi. p. 324.)

Nor, in our opinion, can it be said with truth, that such devout contemplations and pious amplifications and figurative expressions are, at all events, less suitable to the present age. They are out of harmony, indeed, with the spirit of the present age, simply because no age ever needed them more. The one festering evil which in these days eats like a canker into men's spirituality, is the spirit of worldliness; from which flows that foul stream of indifferentism, against which the Holy Father is never weary of inveighing. Now, it is in proportion as the invisible world is made attractive to the imagination and the feelings, that there is the greater hope of its successfully overcoming the charm of things present and transitory. It is precisely, then, such meditations as those of S. Bernardine and S. Alphonsus,—originating with holy men and diffused like a tradition among the body of believers,—which are among the most valuable bulwarks against that formidable foe now so rampantly in the field.

(6). "It seems to be a part of this [evil] system to parallel the Blessed Virgin throughout with her Divine Son, so that every prerogative which belonged to Him by nature or office should be, in some measure, imputed to her" (p. 161). Can there be a more perverse comment than this? If you earnestly love two objects, it is a delight to trace every possible analogy and similarity between them; between their circumstances, their

character, their benefits to you : and the fact, therefore, to which Dr. Pusey draws attention, shows how dearly the lovers of Mary love her Son. But who, except Dr. Pusey and his co-religionists, would dream of drawing the very opposite conclusion ? of inferring that Catholics elevate the Mother into her Son's rival and antagonist ?

(7). Dr. Pusey complains of S. Alphonsus giving the obvious counsel, that Catholics shall ascribe to the Blessed Virgin every privilege which they *can* ascribe to her without theological error. Well, at all events there can be no *theological error* in ascribing to her all those privileges, which you can ascribe to her *without* theological error. And if Dr. Pusey happily becomes a Catholic, he will only be expected to abstain from accusing this opinion of theological error ; he will not be expected to embrace it himself.

(8). We now come to Dr. Pusey's complaint against F. Faber, for saying that "an immense increase of devotion to Mary," "nothing less than an immense one," is among the most desirable of eventualities. First, then, one has to consider what was F. Faber's *authority* for thus speaking ; because, if this were merely his own private bias of opinion, there would be no great need of entering on the discussion. Let it be remembered, however, where the words occur. F. Faber had been translating a book, of which it has been authoritatively decided at Rome that it contains nothing contrary to faith or morals, or to the Church's common sentiment and common practice. (See note at page 177.) The words cited by Dr. Pusey occur in F. Faber's preface to that work ; and they do but say what Ven. Grignon de Montfort earnestly inculcates. Look at such passages as the following in the work itself.

All the rich among the people shall supplicate thy face from age to age, and *particularly at the end of the world* ; that is to say, the greatest Saints, the souls richest in graces and virtues, shall be the most assiduous in praying to our Blessed Lady, and in having her always present as their perfect model to imitate, and their powerful aid to give them succour.

I have said that this would come to pass, particularly at the end of the world, and indeed presently, because *the Most High with His holy Mother* has to form for Himself great Saints, *who shall surpass most of the other Saints in sanctity, as much as the cedars of Lebanon outgrow the little shrubs*, as has been revealed to a holy soul, whose life has been written by a great servant of God.

These great souls, full of grace and zeal, shall be chosen to match themselves against the enemies of God, who shall rage on all sides ; and they shall be *singularly devout to our Blessed Lady*, illuminated by her light, nourished by her milk, led by her spirit, supported by her arm, and sheltered under her protection, so that they shall fight with one hand and build with the



other. With one hand they shall fight, overthrow, and crush the heretics with their heresies, the schismatics with their schisms, the idolators with their idolatries, and the sinners with their impieties. With the other hand *they shall build the temple of the true Solomon, and the mystical city of God; that is to say, the most holy Virgin*, called by the holy Fathers the temple of Solomon and the city of God. By their words and by their examples *they shall bend the whole world to true devotion to Mary*. This shall bring upon them many enemies; but it shall also bring many victories and much glory for God alone. It is this which God revealed to S. Vincent Ferrer, the great apostle of his age, as he has sufficiently noted in one of his works (pp. 25-7).

God, then, wishes to reveal and discover Mary, the masterpiece of His hands, *in these latter times* (p. 28).

It is necessary, then, for the greater knowledge and glory of the Most Holy Trinity, that Mary *should be more known than ever*.

Mary must *shine forth more than ever* in mercy, and in grace, *in these latter times* (p. 29).

*The power of Mary* over all the devils will especially break out in the latter times, when Satan will lay his snares against her heel; that is to say, her humble slaves and her poor children, whom she will raise up to make war against him (p. 33).

God wishes that His holy Mother should be at present *more known, more loved, more honoured, than she has ever been*. This no doubt will take place, if the predestinate enter, with the grace and light of the Holy Ghost, into the interior and perfect practice which I will disclose to them shortly (p. 33).

Now we are as far as possible from denying, that every Catholic has the fullest liberty to think all this utterly mistaken. We only say that F. Faber had fully an equal right to think it true; and that Dr. Pusey, in denouncing it as *intolerable and unsound*, is assailing the Catholic Church herself. Any Catholic, we repeat, may regard the holy writer as *mistaken*; but when Dr. Pusey denounces him as *unsound*, all Catholics are called on to protest against such strictures.

And now as to the statement itself. We know not on what ground Montfort based his predictions as to the future; nor are we acquainted with those "revelations of the saints" to which F. Faber alludes: as to the matter of *fact*, therefore, we can have no opinion whatever. But on the matter of *doctrine*, nothing can be more intelligible than Montfort's and Faber's view. The Church already teaches in a thousand ways that the most effective and acceptable way of contemplating Jesus, is the uniting with His Mother in that contemplation; that the thoughts of Jesus and of Mary should be indissolubly united. We have already vindicated this position against Dr. Pusey,

and on this part of the matter no more need here be said. But now take the ordinary books of prayer and meditation: who can possibly say that the constant union of these two Objects is carried out to one-hundredth part of that extent, which is most readily imaginable? It was Montfort's strong opinion that the time was come when this should be vigorously done; moreover, that its certain result would be a greatly increased knowledge of Mary, and by consequence a greatly increased love of Jesus. So far from there being aught alarming or extravagant in such an opinion, none can well be imagined more obvious and common-sense.

At the same time, we must be never weary of repeating, that all the propositions treated in this particular portion of our article are purely *open* propositions; that neither Dr. Pusey nor any one else whom the Holy Ghost may draw to the Church, need trouble his head about them; that he would only be expected to abstain from censuring them, and to allow in others the same liberty which he exercises himself. Even now he seems ready to do this in the case of Italians and Spaniards;\* why, then, are English lovers of Mary to be placed under a yoke? There are many Englishmen who feel that such worship of Mary as is counselled by the more "extreme" school, is a priceless benefit to their whole spiritual life; why are they to forfeit their privilege, because Dr. Pusey finds his own case different? All such tyrannical and dictatorial proclivities Dr. Pusey doubtless must renounce, before he can be a loyal member of the Roman Catholic Church.

But we must not shrink from encountering the actual passages textually quoted by Dr. Pusey from Catholic writers. Our only difficulty in treating separately each one of these, is the physical impossibility of doing so in one article. But since the Eirenicon was published, a selection has been made of those propositions which, as they stand in its pages, are considered to present the greatest difficulty to a Catholic mind. These are in number twenty-two; and we imagine that Dr. Pusey will himself consider them the most effective in his catalogue. We will consider each one of these without exception:—†

1. S. Alphonsus says: "Those whom the justice of God

---

\* See his words quoted by us last April, p. 438.

† It was absolutely necessary to meet these passages one by one; but we have found ourselves unable so to do, except at the cost of much tediousness. Our readers, however, who may not care for this particular discussion, can pass at once to the last paragraph of this article, without losing any important portion of our argument.

saves not, the infinite mercy of Mary saves by her intercession." Dr. Pusey (p. 103) puts the word "infinite" into italics, as showing the point of his objection; but can he seriously mean that S. Alphonsus lays down, as a dogmatic proposition, the infinitude of Mary's attributes? "I have taken infinite trouble to oblige you," says a friend to Dr. Pusey. "Sir," gravely replies the latter, "you shock me: no one can do anything infinite, save God Alone." S. Alphonsus meant, of course, that our Lady's mercy embraces every kind of evil, moral or spiritual, which can possibly be brought before her in prayer.

2. S. Alphonsus also says (p. 103), "God has resigned into her hands (*if one might say so*), His Omnipotence in the sphere of grace." The very words which we have italicized show that he is not speaking literally; and the general thought has been already explained by us.

3. The vision of the two ladders, already treated. (See p. 181.)

4, 5. Bernardine of Bustis says that "the Blessed Virgin is superior to God, . . . in respect of the manhood which He assumed from her;" and S. Bernardine of Sienna that "He is subject to her command" (p. 103). This we have already explained.

6, 7. That most admirable man, M. Olier, expressed himself in the following strange way:—

We are very unworthy to draw near unto Jesus: and He has a right to repulse [rebuter] us, because of His justice, since, *having entered into all the feelings of His Father from the time of His blessed Resurrection, He finds Himself in the same disposition with the Father toward sinners, i.e., to reject them; so that the difficulty is to induce Him to exchange the office of Judge for that of Advocate; and of a Judge, to make Him a suppliant.* Now this is what the saints effect, and especially the most Blessed Virgin (p. 104).

Now if M. Olier intended this dogmatically, he undoubtedly uttered two heresies: yet most characteristically, while Dr. Pusey is extremely sensitive to the milder of the two, he shows himself profoundly unconscious of that which is far more grievous. It is undoubtedly heretical to think Mary's love of sinners greater than Christ's; but it is a far more grievous heresy to hold that the love felt for them by the Infinite God, is less than that felt for them by the Sacred Humanity. As regards, however, the former heresy, which is the topic of Dr. Pusey's indictment, Mr. Rhodes, in one of his letters (*Weekly Register*, March 3), points out that in the very preceding page M. Olier "proclaims, with

an unusual sweetness and tenderness, the more usual doctrine" on our Lord's most tender sympathy with sinners. We conclude, therefore, that if M. Olier intended dogmatically the words above quoted, he wrote them under some temporary absence or obscurity of mind. But we cannot help regarding it as far more probable, that he did not intend them dogmatically at all; but merely as a practical exhortation to sinners, that they should approach Mary as their special advocate and mediatrix when they have offended her Son.

8. S. Alphonsus adopts the statement (p. 106) that our Lady "is the only refuge of those who have incurred the Divine indignation." This we have explained in p. 184.

9. Dr. Pusey was far oftener asked by Catholics to pray for his conversion to our Lady than to her Son. He has been understood to infer from this that, in the opinion of such Catholics, "Mary alone can obtain a Protestant's conversion;" but no such inference is ever so remotely deducible from the fact he mentions. As to that fact, we have already considered it in p. 171.

10. We now enter on four extracts from Salazar. It must be remembered that his works have never been specially examined at Rome, as have been those of S. Alphonsus and of Montfort; nor, again, have the opinions cited from him any wide currency among Catholics, as have, *e. g.*, those from S. Alphonsus. There would be no difficulty whatever, therefore, in any Catholic abandoning, as theologically erroneous and incapable of defence, whatever might be so judged by him in these respective extracts. Yet we should be extremely surprised if any well-instructed Catholic were disposed to do so, who read them in the context; and to us, certainly, they appear not only in no respect unsound, but edifying and beautiful. We should add also that he is a thoroughly approved theologian; and that those scholastics who refer to him (Lugo does so frequently) always speak of him with every respect. Firstly, then, he says—

It may be questioned whether, if, *per impossibile*, there had been no Will of the Father, and His Mother alone wished and decreed that her Son should die for men, this would suffice that Christ, obeying His Mother, should willingly undergo death. I believe that Christ so deferred to His Mother, that it would have sufficed. *Let others think as they will.* I add that the Mother of God herself embraces the human race with so much love and affection that if, according to the aforesaid supposition, that Will of the Eternal Father were wanting, she would yet, of her own will, choose that her Son should die for men (p. 158-9).

We can see nothing in this extract requiring explanation;

our only wonder is, that any one should stumble at it. It has been understood, indeed, as declaring "that it would have sufficed for the salvation of men if our Lord had died, not to obey His Father, but to defer to the decree of His Mother;" and such a tenet would of course be heretical. But if Dr. Pusey so understands it, his misapprehension seems to us not only extreme but most gratuitous.

11. As He was the Son of God by nature, so, they say, was she "by a more noble right than that of adoption only, a right which emulates in a manner natural filiation" (p. 161).

Those who read this sentence of Dr. Pusey's will hardly be prepared for the fact that, in close context with the words cited, Salazar says expressly, "Mary is the daughter of God by adoption and not by nature." He proceeds, however, to urge that in a certain sense she was the spouse of Christ; and that therefore —apart altogether from her *adopted* filiation,—she was in a certain sense, not indeed God's daughter, but His daughter-in-law. We can readily understand the opinion that this is a trivial fancy; though for ourselves we are rather pleased and touched by it: but when Dr. Pusey raises it into a serious ground of complaint, one's only legitimate inference is that he must be very hard pressed for evidence to his indictment.

12. On the next head we will insert a somewhat more extended extract than Dr. Pusey has given. It occurs in an exposition of the trite text, Prov. viii. 22.

S. Ambrose by the word "*viarum*" understood virtues; and affirms that Christ was created by the Father as a beginning of God's paths, because (says he) to Him was assigned the *first exhibition of all great virtues* (*magnarum virtutum prerogativa*), in such sense, namely, that those Evangelical virtues which had been unknown in previous ages, were disclosed by Him as so many *new paths*: I mean humility, virginity, poverty, and the like. Yet I know not whether Mary may not be more truly called the beginning of these paths or virtues than Christ. *I am speaking of the beginning of execution, and that by way of anticipation, not in the sense of cause.* (Initium inquam executionis anticipatione, non causæ.) Because the Virgin exercised in act those most excellent Evangelical virtues, before Christ came and taught them by word and example. . . . And truly it was suitable\* that the mother should be strong in those virtues which the Son was afterwards to exercise, that He might be said "matrizare," *i. e.*, to reproduce His Mother's character (*matris suæ mores referre*). And thus it was requisite (*oportebat*) that the Virgin's virtues should be such, that the Son in imitating (*imitans*) them should fulfil the office of Saviour.

\* "Ita decuit." Dr. Pusey strangely translates this "*must needs be*" (p. 161).

Now our Lord "fulfilled the office of Saviour," as in other ways, so also in leading a life of spotless sanctity; and it is of course to this particular that reference is here made. Salazar says that He led a spotless life in imitating His Mother's virtues. Now undoubtedly if it were meant by this that, except for her example, He would not have known wherein true virtue consists,—not a word could be said in extenuation of a sentiment so intolerable, revolting, and heretical. But a critic must be absolutely blind with prejudice, who can ascribe to the words any such sense. Salazar is pursuing his favourite theme—the praises of the Deipara; and he gives one special reason of congruity, why it was suitable that she should be so bright and spotless a specimen of virtue. His argument may be thus expressed: "It is a great perfection in a son, as such, if, without thereby being at all the less excellent, he is a true image both of father and mother. Why should we deny this perfection to Christ? I affirm, therefore, that He was a true image both of Father and Mother; that she exhibited the very same virtues which were conspicuous in Him. He led a faultless life then (*Virginis virtutes imitans*), in doing those very good acts which He saw His Mother do."

13. As I have often inculcated, Christ so wrought our redemption, as to call in Mary as an aid in this work. Wherefore as the birth, nature itself guiding, derives strength from the man, but, from the woman, form and beauty; so also our redemption (which was produced, as it were, through Mary and Christ\*) derives from Christ sufficiency, strength, and consistency, but from Mary, beauty and loveliness. For as therefrom, that Christ the Lord worked our redemption, we infer rightly, that nothing of sufficiency or might should be wanting to it; so therefrom, that the Virgin co-operated to the same, we rightly deduce, that nothing of form or beauty could be missed in it. For in some way the grace and beauty of the redemption would fade, if the aforesaid co-operation of the Virgin were lacking.—(Salaz. pro Immac. Virg. Conc., § 14, n. 171.)

Almost immediately after this, Salazar proceeds to say that the Blessed Virgin was "the first and the pattern (*prævia*) among all the redeemed;" words which render his meaning absolutely unmistakable, and which we think Dr. Pusey would have done better to quote. As to the passage which he does quote,—we think it extremely beautiful, but that is a matter of opinion; as to its *theological soundness*, we cannot make any defence where we are absolutely unable to imagine the ground of attack.

---

\* "*Parta per Mariam et Christum.*" Dr. Pusey most inaccurately translates this "*borne by Mary and Christ*" (p. 162, note).



14. From Salazar we now proceed to the Ven. Grignon de Montfort; all whose works, be it remembered, have been carefully examined at Rome, and pronounced to contain nothing contrary to faith or morals, or to the Church's common sentiment and practice. On opening him we find at once a much deeper and more solid vein of thought than in Salazar. He seems to have no leisure (as it were) for those beautiful fancies which delight the Jesuit scholastic; because his whole attention is earnestly concentrated on the great work of man's sanctification and salvation. Nor are we at all surprised at F. Faber's testimony (Preface, p. i.), "that those who take him for their master will hardly be able to name a saint or ascetical writer to whose grace and spirit their mind will be more subject than to his." Further on F. Faber adds—

There is a growing feeling of something inspired and supernatural about it, as we go on studying it; and with that we cannot help experiencing, after repeated readings of it, that its novelty never seems to wear off, nor its fulness to be diminished, nor the fresh fragrance and sensible fire of its unction ever to abate.

And here, before considering in order those various propositions of his which we are specially to treat, we will give one or two other extracts; as illustrating the relative position which he respectively ascribes to our Lord and His Blessed Mother.

I avow, with all the Church, that Mary, being but a mere creature that has come from the hands of the Most High, is, in comparison with His Infinite Majesty, less than an atom; or rather she is nothing at all, because He only is "He who is," and thus by consequence that grand Lord, always independent and sufficient to Himself, never had, and has not now, any absolute need of the Holy Virgin for the accomplishment of His Will and for the manifestation of His Glory (p. 7).

The predestinate will know what is the most sure, the most easy, the most short, and the most perfect means by which to go to *Jesus Christ*; and they will deliver themselves to Mary, body and soul, without reserve, *that they may thus be all for Jesus Christ* (p. 34).

Jesus Christ our Saviour, true God and true Man, ought to be the last end of all our other devotions, *else they are false and delusive*. Jesus Christ is the *alpha* and *omega*, the beginning and the end of all things. We labour not, as the Apostle says, except to render every man *perfect in Jesus Christ*; because it is in Him alone that the whole plenitude of the Divinity dwells, together with all the other plenitudes of graces, virtues, and perfections; because it is in Him alone that we have been blessed with all spiritual benediction; and because He is our only Master, who has to teach us; our only Lord, on whom we ought to depend; our only Head, to whom we must belong; our only Model, to whom we should conform ourselves; *our only*

*Physician who can heal us ; our only Shepherd who can feed us ; our only Way who can lead us ; our only Truth, who can make us grow ; our only Life, who can animate us ; and our only All in all things, who can suffice us.* There has been no other name given under heaven, except the name of Jesus, *by which we can be saved.* God has laid no other foundation of our salvation, of our perfection, and of our glory, except Jesus Christ. *Every building which is not built upon that firm rock is founded upon the moving sand, and sooner or later will fall infallibly.* Every one of the faithful who is not united to Him, as a branch to the stock of the vine, shall fall, shall wither, and shall be fit only to cast into the fire. If we are in Jesus Christ, and Jesus Christ in us, we have no condemnation to fear. Neither the angels of heaven, nor the men of earth, nor the devils of hell, nor any other creatures, can injure us ; because they cannot separate us from the love of God which is in Jesus Christ. By Jesus Christ, with Jesus Christ, in Jesus Christ, we can do all things ; we can render all honour and glory to the Father in the unity of the Holy Ghost ; we can become perfect ourselves, and be to our neighbour a good odour of eternal life.

If, then, we establish the solid devotion to our Blessed Lady, it is only to establish more perfectly the devotion to Jesus Christ, and to put forward an easy and secure means for finding Jesus Christ. *If devotion to our Lady removed us from Jesus Christ, we should have to reject it as an illusion of the devil ; but on the contrary, so far from this being the case, there is nothing which makes devotion to our Lady more necessary for us, as I have already shown, and will show still further hereafter, than that it is the means of finding Jesus Christ perfectly, of loving Him tenderly, and of serving Him faithfully* (pp. 37-9).

We think it most unfair in Dr. Pusey—though we by no means impute to him intentional unfairness—that he has been wholly silent on these most express testimonies. And now for those which he does cite.

God “recognizes” in Mary’s clients “the merits of His Son and of his Holy Mother” (p. 143). So, as we have seen in an indulgenced prayer, we appeal to “the merits of Jesus and Mary.” But Dr. Pusey perverts this elementary statement into the proposition (p. 163) that, “as we are clothed with the merits of Christ, so also with the merits of Mary ;” from which his readers would infer Montfort to have said, that Catholics are clothed with the merits of Mary, *in the same sense* in which they are clothed with those of Christ. It cannot be necessary to explain for the benefit of any Catholic—it is strange it should be necessary for Dr. Pusey’s—that, in Montfort’s view, as in that of any other Catholic, Christ’s merits avail to us in the way of condignity, Mary’s only in the way of congruity ; nay, and that Mary’s own merits rest upon her Son’s as on their one sole condignly meritorious cause.

15, 16, 17. We are here interrupted for a moment by three

consecutive propositions, taken from a young ecclesiastic named Oswald, whose work was placed on the Index. He was, no doubt, animated by the best intentions; for when condemned "*laudabiliter se subjecit.*"

All the remaining propositions are from Montfort.

18. He mentions (p. 125) "souls which are not born of blood, nor of flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God and Mary;" in other words, who savour not of flesh, and blood, and human corruption, but of God and Mary. We are quite unable to understand Dr. Pusey's difficulty, in this most suggestive expression. But, as he refers vaguely in a note to p. 74 as giving special poison to the phrase, we will gratify our pious readers by extracting the page.

Oh! but my labour will have been well expended if this little Writing, falling into the hands of a soul of good dispositions, a soul well born,—born of God and of Mary, and not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man,—should unfold to him, and should, by the grace of the Holy Ghost inspire him with, the excellence and the price of that true and solid devotion to our Blessed Lady, which I am going presently to describe. If I knew that my guilty blood could serve in engraving upon any one's heart the truths which I am writing in honour of my true Mother and Sovereign Mistress, I would use my blood instead of ink to form the letters, in the hope to find some good souls who, by their fidelity to the practice which I teach shall compensate to my dear Mother and Mistress for the losses which she has suffered through my ingratitude and infidelities. I feel myself more than ever animated to believe and to hope all which I have had deeply engraven upon my heart, and have asked of God these many years, namely, that sooner or later the Blessed Virgin shall have more children, servants, and slaves of love than ever; *and that, by this means, Jesus Christ, my dear Master, shall reign more in hearts than ever* (pp. 73-4).

How could Dr. Pusey have the heart to read burning words like these with that cold spirit of criticism, which is so revolting a feature in his whole treatment of Marian doctrine?

19. The concluding extracts occur in an analogy, which to some may seem far-fetched, but which to us appears singularly beautiful; an analogy between that joint office, on the one hand, whereby the Holy Ghost and Mary produced Christ Himself, and that joint office, on the other hand, whereby they form Christ in the individual soul. The paragraphs are not very distinctly expressed; but there can be no doubt as to the general doctrine which they contain. Certain souls permit Mary to "strike her roots" in them; *i.e.*, to produce in them, by her watchful vigilance and unremitting intercession, a real though imperfect image of herself. When the Holy Ghost sees that Mary *has* thus taken root;—or (to use the author's expression), when he sees Mary in those souls;—He

flies to them, and, in conjunction with Mary, performs the "startling wonder" (p. 20) of forming Christ within them. In other words, sanctity in its germs is specially attributed by the author to Mary's intercession. In its maturity, however, it is described as the formation of Jesus Christ in the soul, through the joint agency of the Holy Ghost and Mary. She watchfully intercedes; He puts forth His highest efficacy in training and nurturing the soul; and so the complete image of her Son is more and more effectually produced within it. We wish Dr. Pusey would make this profound thought a matter for his pious contemplation, instead of his captious criticism.

We should further add, what is a first principle in theology, that the Holy Ghost differs from the other Divine Persons, in that he has no *Divine Fecundity*. The Father generates the Son; the Father and Son, by one undivided spiration, produce the Holy Ghost; but He produces no Divine Person. It is only, therefore, in acting on created things that His Fecundity exists. And now our readers will be able to understand the whole extract, as cited from Dr. Pusey's pages. "The Holy Ghost brings into fruitfulness His action by her; producing in her and by her Jesus Christ in His members."

20. Mary is the Queen of heaven and earth by grace, as Jesus is the King of them by nature and by conquest. Now, as the kingdom of Jesus Christ consists principally in the heart and interior of a man—according to that word, "The kingdom of God is within you,"—in like manner the kingdom of our Blessed Lady is principally in the interior of a man, that is to say, his soul; and it is principally in souls that she is more glorified with her Son than in all visible creatures, and that we can call her, as the Saints do, the Queen of hearts.

We are unable to conjecture the objection to these words, and so we pass on.

21, 22. "She and the Holy Ghost produce in the soul extraordinary things; and, when the Holy Ghost finds Mary in a soul, He flies there." These beautiful statements have now been fully elucidated.

And this is all, which Dr. Pusey's extensive learning and intense hatred of Marian devotion have enabled him to bring forward! So far as our own personal feeling is concerned, we can but thank him for the delight he has given us, in making or renewing acquaintance with thoughts so elevating and heavenly.

We explained at starting that we hope in our next number to answer that objection to Marian devotion, which is founded on the alleged silence or contradiction of Scripture and Antiquity.

The particular objection however, to which we have now replied, both *does* and (as we think) *should* influence Protestants far more profoundly than the other; and we trust our readers may think that we have steadily confronted it. This objection alleges that the Church, by her encouragement of such devotions, obscures the thought of God, and fosters in her children a certain approach to idolatry. We fully agree with Canon Oakeley (pp. 40-41), "that this great crux of Dr. Pusey's is a phantom of the devil's creating, and one among the many evidences which history and experience furnish of his implacable hostility to her whom he knows to be the great antagonist of his power." In regard to those Marian doctrines, which the Church inculcates magisterially on all her children, we have maintained that every Christian who accepts and acts on them, will find them invaluable helps to true spirituality. In regard to those further propositions, which have been advocated by holy men with the Church's full permission, we have pursued a middle course. We have pointed out on the one hand, that though no Catholic may censure them, he is not required in any way to believe or even to think about them; and that many practices, most beneficial to one man, may be injurious to another. But we have given it as our own humble opinion, on the other hand, that those whom the Holy Ghost draws to accept and contemplate these propositions, have received from Him a high and special privilege; because such contemplation affords a help, inappreciable and quite singular, towards acquiring unworldliness of spirit, and growing in energetic and tender love for God and for Christ.

---

We accidentally omitted to mention in the proper place, that the error, on our Lady's co-presence in the Eucharist, will be more conveniently treated in our next article on Dr. Pusey.

## Essays and Miscellaneous Papers.

[We do not identify ourselves with the views contained in this article. Last July (p. 260) we expressed an earnest wish that "those who are for keeping heathen literature in its present pre-eminence" would express their answer to obvious objections more clearly than (so far as we know) they have yet done. We have nowhere seen these objections more clearly stated than in the following paper; but we still "hold our own opinion in suspense."]

### THE GAUME CONTROVERSY ON CLASSICAL STUDIES.\*

THERE have been several intimations of late that the spirit which gave birth to the Gaume controversy has not been entirely extinguished. No man of candid mind, who has given any attention to the subject, can for a moment think that the question has ever been satisfactorily settled. Society still continues steadily to advance towards the Paganism of the past; or, rather, revolving in a circle (if that can be called advancing), the faster it appears to go forward, the quicker it is returning back to the point from whence it started. When the circle can be measured by the eye, at a glance, there is no possibility of deception; but when it is as large as the orbit of the earth, the delusion is easily kept up. Comparing the progress of humanity bit by bit, there are certainly appear-

- 
- \* 1. *Discours sur la Nature, la Cause, et le Remède; ou, mal Actuel prononcé à Rome.* Par Mgr. L'Évêque D'AQUILA. Paris: Balitout. 1865.
  - 2. *Memoria dedicata all'Episcopato Cattolico Riunito in Roma nel.* 1862.
  - 3. *Il Paganesimo Antico e Moderno.* Curci. Roma coi Tipi della Civiltà Cattolica. 1862.
  - 4. *Le Ver Rongeur.* Par L'Abbé J. GAUME. Bruxelles. 1851.
  - 5. *Der Kranke Zeitgeist,* von A. PHILALETES. Vien. 1860.
  - 6. *Des Etudes Classiques dans la Société Chrétienne.* Par le R. P. Ch. DANIEL, S.J. Paris: Douniol. 1853.
  - 7. *Christian Classics.* Edited by G. W. ABRAHAM, A.M., LL.D. Dublin: Duffy. 1860.
  - 8. *Le Véritable Esprit de l'Eglise.* Par l'Abbé LANDRIOT. Paris: Douniol. 1854.
  - 9. *La Natura e la Grazia. Discorsi sopra il Naturalismo Moderno detti in Roma nella quaresima del 1861.* Dal P. CARLO M. CURCI, D.C.D.G. Roma. 1865.



ances of advancement; but when the furthest extremes of civilization are brought into juxtaposition with each other, one would almost be tempted to believe that the circle has already been completed.

That this is the opinion of many thinking men of the present day, who can still appreciate the possible influence of genuine Christianity, cannot be called in question. I speak not of men, who, from the ardour of their temperament, or the prejudice of education, or that narrowness which contracts the vision upon a single point of an extensive field, are incapable of forming a rational opinion; but of men of calm judgment, of large and cautious minds, who have silently, and steadily, and for a length of time watched the movements of society, marked its progress, and measured its decay. Nor is this, either, the opinion of an isolated school; or the utterance of a society of alarmists, who edge the brightest things with black; but the express opinion of men, in other things, as wide asunder as the poles, who, forming their premisses out of a common Christianity, elicit an identical conclusion. It would almost seem that, if society continues in its present course, the warning voices of thinking men will gradually cease; and that, like some great overflow, which replaces the variegated beauties of a smiling valley with a monotonous expanse of turgid water, hiding even the very tree-tops from the sight, by degrees even minds, which occupy the most elevated standpoints in the social world, will, at length, sink under in the universal flood. Whether a man, then, be high or low; whether he see far or near; if he be bent beneath the flow of waters, he can be of no more service to his fellow-men than a sunken light-house to a stranded ship.

The danger of which I speak has been more keenly felt and more forcibly expressed by thinkers on the Continent than by ourselves. We can hardly understand, and certainly we cannot fully realize, the intensity of their feelings on this point. Like the warnings of the Prophets of old time, we stop, listen, and go on our way as if nothing at all had happened. We think that it is the way of foreigners to be more demonstrative than ourselves; and that, though they can make much more noise than we, and deal more liberally in superlatives; still, after all, we are every bit as deep thinkers as themselves, and infinitely more accurate in the expression of our thoughts. This, doubtless, is not without a "*fundamentum veritatis*;" yet I do not believe that mere difference of temperament can adequately account for the vivid appreciation which foreign thinkers have of the unhappy state of modern Europe. They are in a far better position for watching the movements

of society than ourselves. The gulf-stream of European thought, rushing into the future, and eddying round the great centres of intellectual activity—Paris, Brussels, Berlin, Vienna, Turin, and Rome—but gently touches our English shores; and, when it strikes a little boisterously, the Englishman makes as little account of it as of a gale of wind, or a spring-tide. As long as commerce, agriculture, and consols are “looking up,” he feels tolerably well contented. He can turn to his fire after breakfast, and run his steady eye down the columns of his morning paper, with the consciousness of a man who has made a hearty meal; and it would take a great many foreign troubles to disturb the serenity of his disposition in this one of the happiest moments of his day. Nay, far from the insecurity of foreign governments and thrones, and the effect of Continental philosophies causing him sensations of alarm; he rather strokes his beard with all the greater satisfaction; and, by the very contrast, feels that he is founded on a rock, and thanks God for the British Constitution. I mean that he would not feel that such occurrences came personally home to him. He would act the part of a simple spectator; as people at a play, or as lookers-on at a pageant. Indeed, a little of the “sensational” is rather in the fashion. There would be “absolutely nothing in the papers,” if there were not some scandal at home, or some catastrophe abroad. It would be the food without the condiments—so useful to secure an appetite, and give relish to a meal. I am, however, far from denying that there are thoughtful men, and many of them, who, full of an amiable philanthropy, keenly sympathize with suffering in every shape; and that there are not a few, who, taking a larger view than is the custom with men living in an insular position, clearly perceive how the philosophies, revolutions, and crises of a foreign nation can affect their own. But though this be granted upon the one side, and much more than this, it cannot be denied upon the other that a man who feels his house to be his “castle” has a much duller sense of danger than one who is standing on a mine.

The true English feeling of security is a psychological emotion almost unknown to foreign thinkers. They live under the shadow of a volcano, and they tread on the ashes of an exploded revolution. The danger is too near home for them to treat it lightly. Its action is too recent, and its effects too hideously frightful, to be easily forgotten. Whether it be France, Italy, Belgium, Spain, or Germany, it is the same: the only question is a question of degree. Strong pressure, and the iron arm, are the magistrates—unlike our “great unpaid”—who keep the peace. Men may be silent,

and self-restrained; but it is not the silence of content; rather that lull which, in the tropics, is the harbinger of a coming storm. The hurricane has swept past before, and may sweep by again. Despotism and Licence, the two component parts of every revolution, as of old days, are not wanting to the world. In every great city of the Continent there is a strong and heaving mass of disaffected men, full of the spirit of '93, idle now, because their hour has not yet come, but ready, when the moment does arrive, to rise on the surface of Society, and with pillage, massacre, and blood, to inaugurate a second Reign of Terror.

For French philosophy, which has long saturated the minds of cultivated men, has penetrated to the masses. A common labourer, in his blouse, knows enough philosophy to enter into the spirit of any revolutionary scheme, but not sufficient to warn him of the consequences. In England, there are few men who can be moved by an "idea;" in France, there are few who can withstand its force. Put an "idea" into a French mind, and it becomes like carbon in a furnace. The quick, hot energy of character; the vivacious, imaginative, and scheming mind, heated by a vague idea of "liberty," and set on fire with the flash of "glory," acts with the force of a dissolvent. The assertion that an English boy picks up notions of rebellion from his author, would be met, had any one the thoughtlessness to make it, as it deserves, with shouts of laughter; to make the same assertion of the French, would be simply the enunciation of a truth. No English boy, in his senses, would dream of being a Brutus or Lycurgus; or if he did, the conceit would soon be kicked out of him at school. One cannot imagine English youths capable of seizing hold of the heroes of antiquity, and so far identifying themselves with those wild, abandoned, desperate characters as to feel an impulse to imitate their lives. One can, indeed, imagine the wit, brilliancy, and pungent satire of Voltaire, seasoned with his habitual contempt for things sacred and divine, gaining possession of the French intelligence; or the bold, vehement, and pathetic language of Rousseau leading men on to desperate resolves; or the uncompromising and awful logic of Babeuf, clenching in the reason that which had been pictured by the fancy; or the grossness and obscenity of the hideous Mirabeau, finding a fitting resting place in minds only less brutal than his own, simply because they lacked his intellectual power; but for youths, for mere boys, to elicit a perfect system of revolution, and fit it to the exigences of their own day, from the lives of men who lived two thousand years ago, under completely different circumstances, and in a different

clime—for mere boys to extricate the character of Pagan assassins and regicides, in all the perfection of their hideous proportions, from where they lay imbedded in the hard Latin—for their minds to thus be set on fire by the books they thumbed at school,—to the prosaic Englishman is a phenomenon to which he has no example to compare. And yet, the reverse of this, at one time at least, in France, seems to have been the exception. We have the testimony of the boys themselves to this startling fact. For instance, in 1790, one tells us that he and his companions were fully prepared at school for the revolution: “The older ones amongst us,” says he, “the very day before the outbreak had gained the prize of rhetoric—the theme consisting of two orations after the manner of Seneca, in favour of the first and second Brutus. The day after, the revolution was the subject of conversation, and people wondered; just as if they ought not to know that in this system of education the revolution is already made!” “As boys,” says another, “we were made familiar with Solon, Lycurgus, and the two Brutus”; and we held them in admiration; as men, we could not refrain from imitating them.” A third, in 1852, speaking for himself and his companions, exclaims: “We were revolutionists, and we glory in it; but we were children of the *renaissance* before we became children of the revolution!” Who were they who stunned the terrified ears of quiet men in '48 with those fearful cries of “Down with the Jesuits, away with the blacks?”; and this not in an isolated place but from Naples to Rome, and from Turin to Friburg? Why, they were the students in our Catholic colleges, who, but a short time before, were parsing and construing, as other boys do, those very authors which had set their intelligences in a blaze.

No wonder, then, that foreign thinkers take a graver view of European society than ourselves! They know the spirit which surrounds them. They feel the danger which harbours at their doors. The diseases, not on the surface alone, but at the very heart of society, which threaten its disintegration, oppress their minds. The Church has pointed out no fewer than eighty-four; and those all mortal. They feel that the political action of the world confirms the utterance of the Church. England and Ireland, Piedmont and Italy, Russia and Poland,—they feel such things as these can never last. The Continent of Europe may seem, indeed, to sleep; but it has the appearance of a sleep which is to issue in a terrific waking. The maniac lies down exhausted, after his fit of desperation—nature is merely recruiting her energies for a fearful repetition. No wonder that foreign thinkers cast about for some saving

remedy! They do not desire the tragedies of the past to be re-acted. They have too vivid a picture before their eyes of past atrocities—of a time, within the memory of living man, when the streets of Paris foamed with blood; when men, women, and children, were huddled together and piled into waggons, to be dragged off, through the din of Paris, to the shambles; when the guillotine with military regularity prosecuted its daily work; when more than one river of France was all alive with birds of prey gorging themselves with human flesh, or following the stream whirling and shrieking round the corpses of the dead; when, in fine, the rapacity of birds of prey was loving-kindness compared with the ferocious brutality of men—of monsters, intoxicated with delight, as they stuffed their pockets full of human ears, or tore the fingers off the hands of little children to stick them for feathers in their caps.\*

It was with the horrors of '48 still fresh before his mind, and with such pictures as these of '93, burning in his imagination, that Abbé Gaume composed his "*Ver Rongeur*." That remarkable production bears within it an unmistakeable testimony that it was written by a man with his intellect on fire. The calm and calculating temper of an abstract philosopher need not be looked for in these pages. There is a fierceness, an energy, a recklessness of consequence, and an audacity in the whole current of his argument, which speaks of a man who has been moved to write, not by the exigencies of the laws of thought, but by the terrible logic of facts—of facts such as the French nation alone seem able to produce; and who, by one desperate intellectual effort—by a kind of mental *coup d'état*—would save a failing world. Nor can it have been otherwise with any man of mind and heart. I would give little for the writings of a man at such a crisis, who could deliberately balance and poise to a hair the conflicting niceties which small and narrow men instinctively seize hold of for darkening and encumbering a great and splendid argument. Who would give anything for the earnestness of a man who could coolly give his mind to such contracted pedantry, when the bone and sinew of the question was clear and unmistakeable; and when a bold utterance and an uncompromising view might possibly save thousands from destruction? It is with unfeigned reverence for the writer, that I read the "*Ver Rongeur*." There is a Catholic breadth of view, a grasp of the entire figure of truth, and an apprecia-

---

\* For these, and similar facts, see Art. Barère, *Edinburgh Review*, April, 1844.

tion of the value of principle—of its awful power—that may be sought for, but never will be found, in the writings of his opponents. They excel more in the minutiae. In this, Abbé Gaume must deliver them the palm. Not even their most strenuous enemies, I imagine, would deny that they have here and there succeeded in picking out a bit of mortar, or chipping a stone, or scratching their names upon a wall, or even breaking a window of that temple of philosophic thought, which they have been unable to destroy. One can almost say to Abbé Gaume, with one or two important reservations, what M. Montalembert wrote to him in October, '51 :—"Notwithstanding some inaccuracies and some exaggerations, which a strict critic would point out, the strength of your argument remains unimpaired, and the bold eloquence with which you develop your theory defies the attacks of your opponents."\*

One great evidence of the weight of metal of the "Ver Rongeur" is the deep impression it produced. Like an earthquake, it staggered the mind of intellectual France from end to end. No sooner did men recover themselves a little, than the war began in earnest. They declared that they were fighting *pro aris et focis*. The destructive doctrines of the "Ver Rongeur" must be put down at any price. All those engaged in education were on the move at once. Venerable Professors of seminaries, who had spent their lives in teaching Pagan classics, appealed to episcopal authority. They would know, if with safe conscience they might continue in that system, which, for a long three hundred years, had been sanctioned by the Church. Mgr. Dupanloup published a reply. With his brilliant diction, his pointed style, and his customary chivalry, he condemned the doctrines of the "Ver Rongeur." Gaume defended himself in his usual uncompromising way, little calculated to quench the flames he had enkindled. The fire now flamed throughout literary France. The daily and weekly papers were full of the controversy. It was taken up by all the periodicals. Each party made capital out of the general disturbance. Gallicans on the one side, Ultramontanes on the other, thought that they saw the fruits of their fundamental principles; while the infidel and Voltairean press found much to ridicule, and satirize, and scoff at. Now was the time for sharp, stinging articles. Here was a grand opening for those rapid, brilliant thrusts, those graceful displays of intellectual skill, which the French alone can exhibit in perfection. This was a glorious oppor-

---

\* The great Cardinal Gousset wrote to the same effect.



tunity, not only for the assertion of first principles of education, but for that peculiar kind of intellectual warfare in which the polished satire, the stinging inuendo, the withering sarcasm, the bright-pointed shaft, delivered with unerring aim, follow each other with marvellous rapidity, and are produced with such graceful dexterity and ease, as completely to dazzle a simple looker on. But the subject was far too serious even for Frenchmen to keep on their best behaviour throughout. Some of the blows were so heavy, and were delivered so well "home," as seriously to interfere with the perfect practice of the amenities. Our polite neighbours at length became so sore, that flesh and blood burst through their French polish. Their genuine nature came out. They set to work in hearty earnest. The small arms, and the graceful display, made way for what certainly was less polite, though perhaps more genuine. Bishop Dupanloup was accused of "nourishing children with poison," and of "feeding angels with the food of devils." Gaume, in turn, was stigmatized as "dishonest;" and was accused of falsifying the Councils, and misquoting the Fathers, and was set down, at once, as a Jansenist, a Lutheran, and a Manichean. The whole controversy terminated, as most quarrels do, by a torrent of abuse on both sides, and by an obstinate claim of victory by each. The *Correspondant*, the *Ami de la Religion*, the *Journal des Debats*, are to be found on the one side; the *Univers*, and then the *Université Catholique*, the *Annales de la Philosophie Chrétienne* upon the other. Abbé Gaume was attacked by MM. Lenormant, Foisset, and the pungent Sacy; and MM. Veuillot, D'Alzon, Roux Lavergne, and Montalembert, carried the war into the camp of the enemy.\*

But the momentary effects of the "Ver Rongeur" are by no means the only evidence of the weight of truth which it contained. There are other evidences of greater force than these. The views of the literary Catholic world have been gradually dissolving from old Pagan pictures, and forming into better things. I do not affirm that many men accept the doctrines of Abbé Gaume without reservation; but this I think no one can deny, viz., that a rapid advance, during the last few years, has been made in their direction.

The critical position of human affairs, the corruption of manners, and the growing naturalism of the day, by their constant pressure and presence, are beginning to make them think. Men now go about in search of remedies; they study the disorder; they would trace it to its spring; they follow up the genesis of

---

\* M. Montalembert's views are now somewhat less pronounced.

mental thought:—they get on to the question of education. The old arguments of the “*Ver Rongeur*” are drawn forth, clothed in modern garb, pared down into less startling proportions and more generally received; for men are beginning to open their eyes to a very old truth, which they could not clearly see before; partly, because it was distorted and caricatured unwillingly, by the impetuosity of him who loved it most; and, partly, because their minds had not been in any way prepared for its reception. Several publications of recent date, the exponents of a large body of thinking men, mark, unmistakably, this progress; and let us indulge an earnest hope that some practical advantage to education may thence result.

Here are three instances of what I mean.

1. We can have no better index to the general movement of the Catholic mind in literature and religion, than the utterances which, from time to time, come forth from the Society of Jesus. Though essentially conservative, that remarkable Society has never held itself so far behind the current of Catholic thought, as to lose its influence over it; nor has it placed itself so much in the advance, as to become an object of general observation. It has, as a rule, firmly, cautiously, and with a practical wisdom, manifested to so great an extent by no other order in the Church, kept pace with the general movement, and influenced its direction; and when it has not been able, through the unmanageable nature of the elements with which it has had to do, to lead, it has had the sagacity to bide its time and follow. It is this instinct which, though it may to “carnal men” savour of human prudence, to men who see things through a spiritual eye, manifests the workings of a governing Providence through one of the most able human instruments which has ever undertaken God’s work upon the earth. It is this reputation for peculiar wisdom, which the Company of Jesus has so fully earned, that gives to the utterances of its representative men a weight which no other religious body can command. These utterances will be sure to possess three striking qualities. They will always be orthodox; they will never be extravagant; and will betoken a prudent sagacity, which not only knows what it ought to say, but when it ought to say it. I should not, however, be absolutely candid, if I did not point out what appears to me, (I will not say the imperfection of those utterances,) but that quality which just weighs them down from the category of absolute perfection, and keeps them in the number of human things:—I mean an extreme, almost, of caution. There nearly always seem to be

powers and forces in reserve. The entire thing is seldom nakedly brought out. One is generally tempted to feel that "there is a great deal more where that came from." And yet, after all, this is the very quality which lends a special weight to what is said.

Now Father Curci is certainly no ordinary or common-place member of this Society; nor would he publicly express sentiments likely to be generally unpopular among his brethren. What has he said on education? During the octave of the Epiphany, 1862, F. Curci delivered, in the church of S. Andrea della Valle, in Rome, before a large and distinguished audience, a course of brilliant lectures on "Ancient and Modern Paganism." These lectures were eventually printed by the press of the *Civiltà Catholica*. Few utterances, one would imagine, would be conceived in terms of more rigid prudence, or be placed before the public with greater weight of authority.

First of all, what does the Father say of the condition of society? The picture which he draws of the state of modern Europe surpasses all the "exaggerations" of Abbé Gaume. It is made up of broad streaks of crimson and carmine. The eloquent orator, surely, has drunk of the torrent of the "Ver Rongeur," and has added the vehemence of the Italian to the impetuosity of the French. Ancient Paganism has been resuscitated. Political Christianity, rationalism, naturalism, sensualism, Cæsarism, are but other names for the old Paganism of 1,800 years ago. Its essence was "the complete separation of the creature from the creator in theory and practice" (p. 31). To this modern society is returning. "Modern society," he says, "is returning with giant strides to paganism; and without resuscitating the grossness of its idolatry [yet who will make so sure of this? It was brought about at the French Revolution, and may be brought about again], it is paganizing in its thoughts, in its loves, in its inclinations, in its works, in its words. So much so indeed that if the contemporaries of Scipio or Coriolanus were to be raised out of this huge sepulchre of this Roman earth, and without noticing our temples and ceremonial were only to attend to the thought, the aspirations, and the conversation of not a few, ahimè! I do not fancy that they would find these very different from themselves, save in *prostration of spirit and enervation of will*" (p. 10).

Here, then, we have a prudent and illustrious member of the most prudent and illustrious order in the Church solemnly declaring in Rome, before the altar of God, in the church of S. Andrea della Valle—what? That a large por-

tion of society in the Eternal City itself, at the present time, is more degraded than those pagans were whose bones lie buried beneath their feet, and that the only point of any material difference between the two consists in this, viz., that the modern pagans suffer from "a prostration of spirit and an enervation of will" to which the worshippers of Venus and Apollo were utter strangers. If any one will take the trouble to read the hard things that were said of Gaume, because he ventured to suggest that society was becoming pagan; how he was scoffed at and lampooned for an extravagant Don Quixote, because he saw further into the future than his busy critics; they will perhaps appreciate the advance that has been made by prudent and cautious men towards the utterances of the "Ver Rongeur."

So much for the state of society. Here Gaume is, after a lapse of years, out-Gaumed on his own ground; and it is not for me to say that F. Curci has exaggerated, in reality, the state of the case a bit. But what of the remedy?

Here it must be confessed the "Ver Rongeur," as far as the exponent of the Society is concerned, has kept its solitary stand. F. Curci does not absolutely condemn pagan classics in the uncompromising terms of Abbé Gaume. But still he manifests a great movement of thought on this vexed question. It is not ridiculed, and satirized, and laughed at, and held up to vulgar scorn; it is treated seriously, carefully; and as if the speaker knew well what an immense influence the great thinkers of the old world have on the present generation. Even this makes one breathe more freely, and look more hopefully into the future.

It is but natural to expect the lecturer to state clearly, what he considers to be the causes of the paganism which he finds so rampant—what relation education, Catholic education, has to the evil. And it is in this very question—the most absorbing that could occupy the Catholic mind,—that F. Curci thinks fit to display that extreme of caution which I have alluded to before. One feels disappointed, but not surprised. With the writings of FF. Minestrier, Porsey, Lebrun, Rapin, and Cotron; and, more recently, of FF. Daniel, Cahours, Prat, and Deschamps, open before his eyes, a cautious utterance must be expected. But, by his very weighing of words in one place, and by his open expression in another, F. Curci shows how far ahead he is of that body of writers which ran full tilt at the "Ver Rongeur." "I don't want to seek (*io non vò cercare*) if, and how far, the study of Greek and Roman classics, which our youth handle in the schools, may have contributed to that exaggerated admiration of Paganism which

has come into fashion in the modern world." Why does not F. Curci want to find that out which everybody else is most eager to discover, and which stands at the very root of the entire question? He continues, "I say this by the way, viz., that such study joined to the catechism, and the holy fear of God, has been universal in centuries of much faith, has been admired (*celebrato*) by men who were not only Christians but saints, without any evil results. And hence if that same study tends to paganize our youth it ought rather to be attributed to the manner than the matter of study. But whether this or any other be the cause of it, the fact is undeniable;—admiration of pagan greatness in common, is encouraged and does not confine itself to theory but enters into practice" (p. 58). Now what is F. Curci's real opinion on this point of Pagan classics? Can it be picked out of the curious uncertainty of his expressions? When a man shirks a cardinal point in a great question, he does not do so without a reason. Now, there are some very weighty names, and weighty books too, occasioned by the Gaume controversy, with which, naturally, the Father would prefer not to come into collision. If he thought as they, he could have no difficulty in saying so; if he did not think with them, what could be more natural than to shirk the question with a "*io non vò cercare?*" This he has done; and, hence, it is but natural to surmise that, were he to utter out his own mind freely, he would simply repeat what the ascetic F. Grou, Pas, André, and Possevin have said before him. At any rate this is certain; that these cautious utterances manifest—(1) that society looks upon the classical question as a far more serious question than it did; and (2) that even here the tide is steadily flowing towards the "*Ver Rongeur*."

2. But if F. Curci did not think it prudent to draw the conclusion himself, which manifestly flows from his premisses, there were not wanting men who were only too delighted to draw it for him. His lectures of 1862 made so deep an impression on thinking minds that they could not resist the temptation to furnish a minor and conclusion to the major premiss which he had borrowed from the "*Ver Rongeur*."

Shortly after the delivery of the lectures, a "Memorial" was published and "dedicated to the Catholic Episcopate assembled in Rome." The author, in weighty words, undertook, as "a sacred duty to society,"—"to draw out the logical consequences which flowed from the solid principles established by Father Curci." "The learned Jesuit," he says, addressing the assembled Episcopate, "having delineated with a power all his own the horrible picture of Paganism living and omnipotent in the

midst of modern society; and having indicated in a certain manner, though not without hesitation, that the cause of this great fact of modern paganism is just this—the imprudent (*improvida*) admiration which has been produced in the minds of youth by the ideas, the men, and the objects of ancient paganism; and having come indirectly to say that society requires a grand reform in education; having proved to admiration the premisses of his argument; but not having drawn the consequences that necessarily flow; as a Christian and a Catholic I have considered it my duty to supply the ‘lacuna’ in this ‘Memorial.’” He then goes on to state what he considers to be the “unico mezzo” for arresting the progress of modern Paganism. It is this: “an *anti-pagan reaction*, which alone can be effected by a mode of teaching which shall be thoroughly saturated with a Catholic element, and shall be able to pour into the mind of youth greater love for the men and things of Christianity, and less love and enthusiasm for the men, the ideas, and the things of the Pagans” (p. 6). Again: “It would be a crime not to modify *immediately* and *profoundly* a system of teaching which has not prevented, if it has not prepared the way for, the supreme catastrophe with which the world is threatened. It must be admitted, then, that this reform in its essence must consist in giving the *first place* to Christian authors; and *only the second* to Pagan authors; in being much more guarded in praising paganism, through its heroes and its works; and much less so in extolling Christianity through its heroes, its literature, its fine arts, and its works”\* (p. 41). So far, then, it can be seen (1) that F. Curci has out-distanced the “Ver Rongeur” in his picture of modern paganism; and that the author of the “Memorial” is at one with the illustrious Jesuit; next, (2) that the author of the “Memorial” is ahead of F. Curci, at all events in actual expression, respecting the remedy to be adopted; and has advanced a good step nearer to Abbé Gaume.

3. But not only does public feeling seem to be so far affected as to urge an address to the Catholic Hierarchy; but, moreover, what is most significant, a distinguished member of that venerable body boldly comes forward in the Eternal City and proclaims the very principles developed by Abbé Gaume. The Bishop of Aquila read a paper in September, 1864, before the Academy of the Catholic Religion in Rome. He was at liberty to select his own subject. He chose, what he considered, the most important question of the day. He treated of “the nature, cause, and remedy of the present

---

\* The italics are his own.



evil." His whole argument might have been taken from the "Ver Rongeur." It is very simple. There are four great "notes" of modern society:—Rationalism, Sensualism, Caesarism, and Anti-Catholicism. His lordship develops each of these "notes;" and fearful indeed is the picture that he draws. He concludes that Europe is visibly hurrying on to Paganism; or, "to speak with more precision, to Satanism" (p. 29). He demonstrates how those four "notes" were the marks of the ancient Pagan world. He declares Christendom to have been Christian till the Renaissance. Then Pagan classics were introduced. Europe became intoxicated with the old evil, prevaricated, and has completely fallen away. What is the remedy? There is "but one." "The salvation of society, and its return to sincere Christianity, alone can be effected by an intimate application, of Catholicity to youth in the period of literary and scientific education" (p. 53) His lordship, who had studied the question—unlike those who have had a fear of doing so—is certain that a little "catechism" and "il santo timor di Dio" will not alone effect salvation. Youth must have a "solid, extended, and substantial religious instruction" (p. 57). He would replace the study of the Pagan classics by the study of (1) the Scriptures, (2) the Fathers, (3) the lives of the saints, and (4) the acts of the martyrs. He does not explicitly state that he absolutely excludes all Pagan classics; but this is certain, that he reduces them to a *minimum*.\*

These are the broad lines of the eloquent discourse delivered by the learned Bishop. His views are in advance of F. Curci's; are more explicit than the "Memorial"—in point of fact, the whole brochure is nothing but *Gaume*, intensified by compression, and done into Italian. In plain English, the Accademia was listening to the "Ver Rongeur;" and seven Princes of the Church, a score of Bishops, and a large and brilliant company of Prelates, scientific men, and learned members of religious orders, attested, by their presence on that day, how great a change has come over the minds of enlightened men since 1851. And when one comes to consider that the three works, which have just been noticed, severally represent a large, a growing class of Catholic thinkers, who hold views more or less identical with one or other of them; when one considers what intellectual obstacles, what stumbling-blocks of prejudice, taste, and education many of these men must have had to remove away, before they could possibly arrive at their present

---

\* The Bishop and "Der kranke Zeitgeist" are strikingly at one in their view of the state of society. See "Der Katholik," Marz, p. 370.

intellectual position; when one studies the Gaume controversy as it presents itself in 1851, with its rabid "war to the knife;" and then fixes one's thoughts on its position in 1866, who can repress the feeling that there must be some fearful "coming events" to cast such shadows as these before? Like the dumb brutes, one feels as if the thunder-clap is coming, and the torrent will soon be here; and one feels urged as by an instinct to walk quietly and silently to shelter. A man may be conscious of its presence, though he don't know how to prove it. And another thought; this rapid advance upon unpalatable doctrine—which to many is bitter enough—this scream for the knife, to my mind is a stronger proof than all the logic in the world that an operation is required. Who has the firm determined will, the instrument, the steady hand for lopping off the limb? And who has the power to summon up his energies in the centre of his soul, and keep them steady there, till one-half his life be cut away?

But there is one other thought which bends one down by its oppressiveness, and creates a straining anxiety in the mind:—How do we stand in England? What bearing have these growing views of Catholic continental thinkers on our country?—on that small scattered few who are growing up like some chance seeds which have been dropped amidst the thorns and tangles of a wilderness? How far are the views of F. Curci applicable here? Can the "Memorial" be applied to us? Does the right Rev. Prelate's picture include the British Islands? In a word, to put once more those simple questions to which we have principally confined ourselves throughout:—What are the conditions of society in England? and what is the remedy for the disease, if disease exists?

1. We have already witnessed to the growing feeling on the Continent, that European society is swiftly tending to make its watchword, "*Adoremus Satanam.*" Now, let me grant, as I willingly do, that society in England is as yet in a far less debased condition than on many parts of the Continent. Still, can any one with his eyes open doubt that it is tending in the same direction? Are not the four features by which the Bishop of Aquila identifies modern with ancient Paganism as truly visible, though not as prominent, in England as abroad? Is there not (1) "an emancipation of reason from all divine authority respecting dogma?" is there not (2) "an emancipation of the flesh from all divine authority regarding public and private manners?" is there not (3) "an emancipation of social power from all divine authority in politics?" and is there not (4) every bit as great "a hatred of the Catholic Church and her institutions?" (p. 12). If the reader does

not see that there is, unfortunately we have no space to prove it to him here.

But he may urge that we have already destroyed, or at all events considerably weakened, the force of our argument at the beginning of this paper; for we stated that the English mind is very different, *e.g.*, from the French—that Englishmen (1) are not moved to revolution by their books at school; that (2) they are not easily inflamed by an idea; and (3) that they possess a sense of security unknown to foreigners. This is true; and it would seem that those three facts—two relating to the “intellectual build” of Englishmen, and the third to the circumstances of their lives,—are the three very conditions which render English Paganism far more difficult to deal with than the foreign form. It is the nature of foreign Paganism to manifest itself in fanciful extravagance; the foundation on which foreigners build their “castles” is not much more substantial than the superstructures; the earthquake of a revolution, or some frightful catastrophe, generally the result indeed of their “ideas,” quenches their fever, and brings them to their senses. With the Englishman the case is different. He is more cool, calculating, and plodding: if he does Paganize, he does so commercially. There is a basis of hard, common, worldly sense to all he does. He does not easily allow himself to be caught in an absurdity. He possesses an innate respect for power and authority. In his own way he fears God and honours the king. This temper of mind, which may be the result of the practical working of the polity under which he lives, permeates all his religious views. Indeed, now-a-days, there is a large, and it may be hoped, an increasing body of men who, breaking through mere human propriety and ideas of fitness, really apprehend the supernatural. From these, downwards to the most gross-minded unbeliever, there is a gentle gradation, the great bulk being made up of those who transfer the political temper of their minds to their relation with the Creator and Master of all. Their human appreciation of order, dignity, and position—their acknowledgement of the good, the beautiful, and the true in the plane of religion, gives a respectability and a seemingness to their religious performances, and a tone of deference to their conduct, which, in the absence of something higher and more ennobling, is by no means to be despised. Indeed this kind of appreciation for the supernatural is far more wide-spread in their country than is the catholic feeling for it on the Continent. Like gold-leaf it spreads over a very extensive area, but when put in the balance, it does not weigh many carats. What gains in extension in this country, gains

in intensity abroad. Where the supernatural is acknowledged on the Continent it is put down at its real worth—it at once makes the balance kick the beam.

In England, then, men quietly, naturally, and without any shock at all—indeed, as an act of just propriety—assimilate themselves to the systems which they see around them, and according to the nature of each, sink or rise between the two extremes of utter unbelief or fragmentary adherence to a supernatural standard. Which way *nature* is inclined to turn the scale is very evident. And the danger of such vacillation is not to be ignored. More or less, naturalism must infect the country—for it is Protestant. The question is only of degree. The pure value of the supernatural is not found outside the Church of God. And if a man places himself upon an inclined plane, we know pretty well which way he slips. What we call naturalism, F. Curci calls by the more startling epithet of “Paganism.” “Don’t imagine,” says this Father, “that a man cannot be a Pagan without adoring idols; nothing of the kind! (*oh! niente affatto!*) Paganism in its constitutive parts, in its formal nature (*nella sua ragione formale di essere*) means nothing more or less than *naturalism*” (p. 14). England, then, in its own way, may be said to suffer from a less intensive form of the disease of Paganism than the Continent. It is not fantastical—not “French.” It is founded more on propriety, fitness, and a reverence for order and authority, which is peculiar to the people.

It is into this atmosphere, created by the breath of seventeen million lungs, more or less corrupted by the taint of naturalism, that the hope and promise of England as a Catholic country is thrown. And on thinking upon the small handful that represents the Church—how our young men are enveloped with this atmosphere deprived of every element of life; what temptations are held out to them abroad; how the spirit of the times even finds them out at home; how easily they can forget the serious responsibility of their lives; how they will have to answer for more than the number of rabbits they have shot, how many fish they have killed, or how best they have been able to while away their time in frivolities which are often worse than useless;—the heart would almost sink within one. But then, again, let us fix our thoughts on what they *might* be, the work they *might* accomplish, the great things that a few earnest, detached men might achieve in England, where even what is noble in a Catholic character finds its recognition at last; when the imagination, or rather the reasoning faculty, is suffered to draw legitimate conclusions—which spread out before the mind like a sort of Paradise—from hypotheses which, for mere shame,

cannot be called extravagant. When such play as this is given to the intelligence, both heart and head at once are fired with a flame of hope that something may yet be done; that minds, that broad, experienced, many-sided minds, will look into our danger, and provide a remedy against that lightness of character, that easy-going *dilettante* spirit, that small appreciation of the serious position of Catholic men in this country, and that want of a large, broad, Catholic view of life,—that keeping of all the pores of the spirit open to the poisonous atmosphere of the pagan English world, which, alas! is far too prevalent with our rising generation. Who is coming on? To whom have we to look? Who are to be our Catholic leaders, to give a tone to Catholic thought, to display the loveliness of our Religion, to prove to the pagan world in which they live, like the great men of old, that Christ is more beautiful than the world, that His Truth is deeper, wider, more encompassing than the Pagan counterfeit; that we can be polished, refined, educated; that we can win and overcome; that we have power and strength? Who, I say, can show Catholicity *impersonated*, and by his very manhood, overflowing with true Christian grace, shame into their hiding-places those bold, proud, seducing representatives of naturalism, which stalk before us as specimens of perfection, and masters of the world?

Unless a very powerful antidote be applied against that naturalism which is the ocean in which men live their lives; unless something, not negative alone, but positive, be done for the human spirit when first it begins to open out and feel its way in this anarchical world in which we live; unless the disease be treated in its first symptoms, I say firmly, and with a sad sternness filling my mind, that those grand, those glorious possibilities, which overflow the heart, and almost make the eyes swim to think of them, will drop down dead and withered like the blighted promises of spring.

2. What, then, it will here be asked, do I propose for strengthening the system, and preparing it against the rude atmosphere of English life?

The answer to this question is contained in the history of the Universal Church, not for three or four short centuries, but during the long term of fourteen hundred years. I purpose to give a very short but broad, clear, general impression of the temper of the teaching element during that space; and purposely avoid, in so doing, all small, narrow questions, which present difficulties, but cannot obscure the grand general result. Too much has been made of these. P. Daniel's perseverent ferreting into details, like a German watchmaker,

has seemingly ruined his vision for aught else but the cogs, screws, and wheels of history, and has utterly unfitted him for that broad philosophy which gives them a position and significance, and points out their relative worth. Compare, as a glaring example of what I mean, his chapter on the Renaissance, with what Dr. Newman says of it.\* All these minutiae must be cast aside, not because they are not valuable in their proper place, but because here, in reality, they are beside the issue.

First, then, I will give the broad effect of teaching, (1) from the Apostles to the destruction of the Roman Empire, very rapidly: then (2) from the destruction of the Roman Empire to the Renaissance. In this the answer is held in solution; presently it will be precipitated into a tangible form.

1. The education, then, which children received in the age of the Apostles, *à priori*, one would imagine would be Apostolic. The Miracles and merciful Passion of our Saviour had hardly had time to pass into the pages of history. His blessed life was still sufficiently near to invigorate with its presence the minds of his followers. The Apostles, moreover, had borne away a portion of that fire in their breasts which had consumed the Victim of Cavalry, and kept alive the heroism of the Cross in the hearts of the faithful. But, besides receiving an illumination from so great a nearness to Christ, there were other motives, sterner and sadder, which urged Christians to keep close under the light of Truth, and build themselves up in fear, yea, and in trembling too, under the mighty Hand of God. Those were seasons of expectation and of prayer—of waiting for the day to be revealed. Those were seasons in which parents kept their garments, and watched; and prepared their children to be strong and steadfast, to be pure, holy, and undefiled in the midst of a corrupt generation and a persecuting race. Naturally, the education of those days would receive its colour from the circumstances with which it was surrounded. The supernatural would be all in all. The possibilities of the future would keep the Christian's mind on a higher goal than earth. He would look upon his child as a tender "lily among thorns." He would point out to him the better land—to which he might any day be called. He would direct his young eyes to the invisible, teach his

---

\* Compare cap. vii. p. 179, seq. of "Des Etudes Classiques dans la Société Chrétienne" of P. Daniel, with Dr. Newman's "Mission of S. Philip Neri," p. 8; also with "Lectures on the present Position of Catholics in England," Lecture II. p. 65.



young heart to love the heroism of the Cross, and his whole aspiration to be after the kingdom to come.

In those days our present classics were in the full vigour of their life. What we now learn with much drudgery, they acquired with all the ease of the vernacular. Hence, children did not go so soon as we to school. They remained longer under the paternal roof, and breathed for a longer while the healthy atmosphere of home influence. Their classics were exclusively Christian. The letters of the Popes, the lives of the Saints, the acts of the Martyrs,—these were their Horace, their Cicero, their Virgil. Then they were practised in sacred song. They learnt by heart the Psalter of David. They were instructed in the mysteries of Faith, in the life of Christ, in high and noble principles of Christian charity, in sacrifice of self, and self-abandonment to God—in a word, they were moulded into athletes ready to fight the battles of Christianity, and to hold life cheap, in a question of testifying to the faith by personal loss.

The Apostolic Constitutions are a valuable witness to the spirit which animated the disciples of old. They stigmatize, in no very measured terms, Pagan writings as profane and diabolical. They warn the faithful against them, in somewhat the same spirit with which the Jews, anterior to the captivity, were warned against worshipping stocks and stones. A kind of infection was supposed to attach to them; and the literature of the heathen world was avoided, as we should shun the habiliments of a man who had died of plague. The Scripture was the grand disinfectant of those days. If the mind of youth were steeped in its holy spirit there would be comparatively little danger, it was thought, from the poison floating in the Pagan atmosphere of the heathen world. This strong faith in the efficacy of the Word of God runs through the entire history of the early ages. In the lives of all celebrated Christian men and enlightened women, this one trait is never wanting. What is more affecting than the young Origen, drinking deep of the spirit of the fire of the chalice of the Lord in tender youth, and his preparation, through that invigorating draught, for his eventful and chequered life? What Eusebius says of Origen can, with little variation, be also said of the early days of S. Gregory and S. Basil. They were nurtured in the same fear and love, and were, from the spring-day of their intellectual life, ignited with the same celestial fire. The early education of Macrina, as written by S. Gregory of Nyssa, opens another cleft in the rock of the past, through which can easily be seen how wide-spread was the spirit of Scripture education in ancient days. Macrina

herself was educated by a mother of gentle, holy life, in the unspotted light of Gospel truth. She handed down the tradition she received. She brought up her brother, Peter, as she had been brought up herself. It is but natural that youths, who had thus been educated, should feel anxious that others should reap the same advantages as themselves. The Fathers, east and west, accord in their appreciation of Gospel education. S. Jerome, in his letter to Gaudentius, makes out a complete curriculum for various portions of Holy Writ for young Pacatula. And with the same earnestness with which he recommends the Word of God, he condemns any predominance being given to Pagan letters. "It is always a scandal," he says, in his vigorous way, "to see a Christian soul in a temple of idols." S. Chrysostom and S. Basil take the same view as S. Jerome. They lay it down as a first principle of Christian education that children destined for the world should learn and live in the atmosphere of Sacred Scripture.

It was thus that they were prepared for the heathen author, or to sit at the feet of the Pagan professor. S. Chrysostom and Basil were already men when they studied under the rhetorician Libanius. S. Gregory of Nazianzen had passed boyhood, when he commenced his travels to Cæsarea, to Alexandria, and to Athens. S. Jerome was eighteen when he commenced grammar under Donatus. For, be it remembered, to gain ever so slight a tincture of letters in the days of the early Church, it was absolutely necessary to drink from a Pagan fount. The Pagans had entirely monopolized the rich domain of literature and science. Every chair of learning was filled by a Pagan professor. If a Christian would teach, perforce he would have to make use of the models of elegance and purity of style in fashion in those days. If he would have scholars, he must teach what scholars would care to learn.

But in spite of this seeming necessity for frequenting Pagan schools, and perusing Pagan authors, the majority of the Fathers looked unfavourably on the practice. The minority, who, seeing the difficulty in which Christians were placed, had approved the custom which had obtained, no sooner perceived the appearances of a germ of literature in the field of Christian speculation, than they warned their children with great earnestness of the danger to which their souls were exposed by the influence of Pagan letters. The writings of S. Athanasius and S. Basil, and of the two SS. Gregorys, are sufficient confirmation of this statement; while S. Chrysostom, S. Jerome, and S. Augustine, seem to have been purposely raised

up for closing the doors of the Pagan schools, and beginning a new literary era. Then came the grand crash—Imperial Rome with its monuments, its arts, its classics, its rhetoricians, its luxuries and fascinations, sunk under and perished in the flood that swept down from the North.

(2) But the destruction of the Roman empire by the barbarian hordes did not annihilate the tradition of Christian teaching. Though the Church was bent down for the moment in the general visitation, she rose up from her trial more powerful and more vigorous than before. The very movement created in her by the anger of the elements, fastened her roots the more firmly to the rock; and the fall and crash of the giant which overshadowed her, heralded in her undivided sway over a renovated world.

Now, at last, she had full scope for carrying out, in its entire breadth, the Divine commission with which she had been entrusted. Now, at length, the grand obstacle had been removed, which stood in the way of the onward press of her power. The Romans of the empire had perished, together with the civilization which they had created. A new race, vigorous, virgin, and robust; unbroken by the effeminacy of an enervating civilization; fresh out of the glowing hand of a rude and healthy nature; brave, honest, and impressionable; adorned with the sublime simplicity of unadulterated manhood; and though half-educated, half-polished, and unrefined, still capable of being tempered into the noblest types of civilized perfection; occupied the place of that effete and sickly generation which had passed away. The penetrating eye of the Church saw her advantage at a glance. She looked with triumph on those rough treasures which had been collected out of the fastnesses of the North, and had been, with a profuse but not too gentle hand, showered at her feet. She saw in those strong and hardy frames, in those brave and simple hearts, material which might be manipulated to high and holy purposes. She felt herself at once a "*Matrem filiorum lætantem.*" And, with all that confidence which inspiration gives, and all that joy which illuminates the certainty of success, she set about raising of those stones children to Abraham.

And how did she set about her work? Did she collect together the *dicta* of the ancient philosophers, ransack the earth for their hidden wisdom, and endeavour to dig out of the ruins of an empire that was, materials for insuring the splendour of an empire to be? Did she draw together the shreds and tatters of ancient letters which had been scattered about her; and essay to draw, out of the dust of an exploded life,

that polish of manners and that refinement of mind which threw a halo of fascination over the huge polity of Rome as it crumbled to the fall? Did she try to lift up the fallen world, set it on its feet, and drug it into life with potions of that Greco-Roman civilization which had once animated its frame from end to end? No. She cast her eyes back, indeed, into the past; but not into the past of Pagan greatness. Her vision carried her not to the *Domus Aurea* of the Cæsars, but to the Cross of Calvary; not to the learning of the philosophers, but to the simple principles of apostolic life; not to the glory of this world, but to the glory of the world to come. She stood to her Traditions. Her only aim and the summit-point of her dearest ambition was to plant Christ Crucified in the midst of those rugged natures which had collected round her, and to construct a new civilization, not upon the frail but gorgeous platform of worldly greatness, but upon the imperishable framework of an everlasting religion. By what means was this accomplished? By the means which she had made use of from the beginning—by education. By a Christian education. By a Christian education of the young. By that very same means which had, over and over again, been recommended by the great doctors of the Early Church, by S. Basil, by S. Gregory, by S. Chrysostom, by S. Jerome, by S. Austin. By forming the supple heart and elastic mind of youth on a Christian model.

And how was this accomplished? The Latin language, during the middle ages, or, at least, during a great part of them, was the common language of the people of Europe. Up to the ninth century, Greek, also, seems to have been pretty generally known. Hence, as in the first ages, children remained long under the paternal roof. Their classics were almost the same as in the days of the Empire. But there was this significant difference—the use of Pagan classics had greatly diminished, whereas the number of Christian classics had considerably increased. The Scriptures, the *Liber Passionum*, the works of the Fathers, the Legends of the Saints, the histories of the holy wars, the Travels of Pilgrims, the wonderful lives of remarkable men, and founders of religious orders; these were the chief instruments for forming the minds of youth. Nor was this all. The influence of Christianity was brought to bear upon the plastic heart and intelligence of the child, not only through the classics, but in a still more constraining manner, by means of that vast organization which by degrees spread itself over the face of Europe. Its ruins are still amongst us, which, beautiful in their decay, even now proclaim the majesty of our Fathers in

their generation, the cathedrals and monasteries, the presbyteries and palaces, which, like the night stars of Heaven, shed their calm, intellectual light, over a christianized world. In these seed-plots of a noble and elevated Christianity, the same course of education which had been initiated at home, was more fully developed. Those who had abandoned everything out of love for the Crucified, were not the men to hide the fire in their bosoms. They were as incendiaries, setting everyone on fire with the love of Christ. That which so fully possessed their beings, penetrated into every manifestation of their lives. The very system of knowledge which they imparted, partook of the universal influence. God was all in all. He was King, Lord, Master, of every order, of every realm. From the huge foundations to the uttermost spiral whorl of that splendid cathedral of mediæval knowledge, one spirit was made manifest,—one simple and sublime spirit, which gave a unity to its overwhelming complexity of parts, and breathed a meaning into every stone—the spirit of the Crucified. In literature, in language, in arts, in philosophy, in science, in religion, in the family, and in society, wherever man lived, wherever the influence of man's hand or mind extended; wherever you could trace his breath—there breathed the dominant spirit of the Ages of Faith—there was incarnate, in oil and in glass, in stone and in marble, in poetry and in fiction, in drama and in song, in public and in private, on the hill-top and in the valley, in the town and in the country,—*ubique*, that which gave breath, life, reality, meaning to the existence of the creature,—Christ Crucified. The great aim of man, then, seems to have been to make Christ live upon the earth. Christian society became enamoured of our Lord. And the more men thought of Him, the more they melted everything into His image. They would as soon have thought of creating light by blotting out the Sun, as of gaining even so poor a glimmering of science, where God was not.

Nor did the leaven of religion, which ran through their teaching, interfere with the strictness of scientific method. The establishing the Creator in the midst of His creatures, did not make truth less true, nor science less persuasive. God was the acknowledged centre, from which all rays of human knowledge flow, and to which they all should tend. But the centre, far from confusing the circumference, lent to it a reality, which belonged to its very definition. Around this centre, the ever expanding circle of human cognition developed in the fulness of God's light. As is natural, the sciences partook in their degree of the stability of Him to

whom they were referred. The well-known course of the *trivium* and *quadrivium*, with little variation, can be traced from the days of Capella, in the fifth century, to the end of the ages of Faith. For many centuries it held undivided sway. It formed generations of wise and holy men. It formed men of every variety of type, of every variety of occupation. Philosophers, statesmen, lawgivers, kings, popes, soldiers, poets; men eloquent with the tongue, men eloquent with the pen—it laid for them all one thing in common—a broad, deep, consolidated, granite foundation of science, not secularized from God, but acknowledging and adoring Him in the midst. Him they know to be the Stay, as well as the Maker of all. They felt, as it were, in their own weakness, that the *scibile*, like the foundations of the world itself, rested on the Living God—that “underneath were the Eternal Arms.” God is not separate from knowledge in reality; nor is knowledge separate from God; nor was there one in those days who dared divorce them by a vicious abstraction from each other. Filled with the holy traditions of his childhood, and illumined by a Christian course of education, the Christian youth left the calm atmosphere of the cloister, the Presbytery, or Bishop’s Palace, and commenced, with a heart as full of God as of knowledge, his university career.

At the university he found the same spirit, which he had learned to admire when poring over the *Liber Passionum*, or the Life of our Lord, in the days of his boyhood. He found that same spirit elevated, expanded, developed to a system,—and fitting to the growth and maturity of his mind. What, as a boy, had merely the power to stir the depth of his heart or set his fancy in a flame, now could be weighed and appreciated by his intelligence, and become rooted in the newly-cultivated ground of his expanding reason. What home had done for his heart, what school had done for his memory,—that the University did for his intelligence. The spring of his affections had been directed to his Supreme Good in the first; his memory had been stored with a varied wealth of *nova et vetera* in the second; in the third, he learnt how to grasp his knowledge as a whole, how to understand the relations of its various parts, and their respective values: what was his own position—his relation to God, to man, to Creation; he learnt to adore his Maker, to grasp the *scibile*, and to understand himself; he was unfolded from the Christian boy into the Christian man; he was prepared to meet the world, to struggle with it, to do his work in his place, and ever to keep his eye upon that last end for which he was created. His infancy, his boyhood, his youth, his manhood, all were under one supreme,



absorbing, abiding influence,—the influence of an unspotted Christian Religion, luminous in so many examples of the past, brilliant in so many examples of the present, streaming forth from every pore of that great society which pressed upon him on every side, and encompassed him with an atmosphere of faith and charity, which in itself was little less than a *médecine* of life and immortality.

Now, what is the impression left upon the mind by the outline we have attempted to draw? I do not ask whether it be true or false that classics were much studied before the Renaissance; nor do I enter into the influence of living Paganism on the Christian mind in the early ages. I am not discussing the good or evil effects of the revival of letters; nor is there need to settle the endless disputes which would make S. Jerome, S. Basil, S. Austin, and a dozen more Fathers and schoolmen, contradict each other, and themselves, in successive sentences on the question of education. Nor, supposing the students of the middle ages did pore over the writings of the Pagans, am I called upon to demonstrate that the wretched manuscripts from which they studied, were of themselves sufficient preservatives from danger. All these are very interesting, and by no means unimportant topics: but they have little to say to the one large general impression—the striking picture left upon the mind after the study of those fourteen centuries of Christianity. They may present, indeed, difficulties,—but they can no more prevent the onward flow of the majestic traditionary teaching of the Church, than the pebbles that raise a ripple in a stream can impede the steady progress of its waters.

And this is where, in my poor opinion, Abbé Gaume, notwithstanding his breadth of view, made a great mistake. I will bring this forward now, because it leads straight to the answer. It was a natural mistake when we think of his position. He saw the crying need. He felt that some specific enemy had done these things. Besides, the public would not heed vague and general complaints. It must be a distinct charge against a specific evil. Where, then, could the devastating enemy be found—the wild beast which had done such slaughter? The Abbé tracked him to his earth, by the bloody footmarks of the French Revolution. Here, thought he to himself, is the animal at last, which has committed all this havoc—we must destroy him, and then peace and plenty will be our share again:—little thinking, seemingly, that a forest which could produce one such beast, most probably would harbour many more.

That Pagan classics had a great share in the deterioration of  
VOL. VII.—NO. XIII. [*New Series.*]

the world on the Continent, where they were thrown into the furnaces of French and Italian minds, is a proposition, I presume, no thinking man would deny. But that the sum of human miseries, even on the Continent, should be put down exclusively to their door, seems to me very like ignoring altogether other causes of disorder, that, in reality, every one believe to have a substantive existence. I believe that the wood contains more than one wild beast; and that Pagan classics have quite enough to answer for on their own account, without being made the scapegoat for the accumulated sins of the civilized world. Had Abbé Gaume been satisfied with showing the real mischief they had done, and the real danger they contain; had he pointed out the abnormal position which they occupy; he would have rendered a still greater service to society. But, as has been said before, he drew a picture which repelled many, because the proportions were extravagant.

He made also, I think, another mistake; viz., in the particular shape which he gave to his practical suggestions. It would have been better to lay his whole stress and emphasis on the positive element which he desired to introduce; and to speak against classical studies only so far as their undue pre-eminence interferes with giving a primary place to what is really primary.

Still he has done incalculable service. His admirable development of the Christian "System," and its working in human life, has never been surpassed. It is a grand vision of a Christian intelligence; and the effects of the Pagan "system," which stands over against it, throw a strong glare of light upon the hideous proportions of the merely natural man. But, as I said just now, the desired end is not *directly* to overthrow what is heathen; but to do so *indirectly* through introducing what is Christian. Life is intensely positive; and to give life, or to sustain its energy, something positive is required. A *negative* good will not do; the good must be positive. As justification consists, not so much in being free from sin, as in being possessed of a positive spiritual favour; just as a man should not only avoid evil, but should do good also:—so the remedy for the corrupt state of society must consist in some positive actual good:—a positive good, indeed, the privation of which constitutes that very disease which its presence is calculated to cure. What, then, is the disease of the present day? We have seen, *Naturalism*. What is Naturalism? F. Curci has already told us:—"The complete separation of the creature from the Creator in theory and in practice" (p. 31). What is the privation or loss which constitutes this disease? The loss of the Creator. What the remedy? Join

man again to God. How is this effected? By realizing the Supernatural. "*Realize the Supernatural*"—this grand formula covers the entire area of the broad question of Paganism. It contains a force equal, nay, more than equal, to the energy of the disease. It is not a barren fact, or a mere *hiatus*,—but a large, encompassing principle, pregnant with vitality:—like the "*Fiat lux*" of old, which flashed day over creation.

This it is that was done in the fourteen first centuries of Christendom—the supernatural was realized. This, I maintain, is the grand, general impression left upon the mind after studying the history of that vast tract of Christianity. From the Apostles to the Apologists; from the Apologists to the columnal Fathers;—from the Catacombs to the glories of Mediæval times, this realization seems to have been the main governing law of the human spirit. I have only space to suggest that such was the case, and that this formula is a key capable of solving difficulties, which, without it, never could be answered. It explains the fear the Fathers had of ancient letters; it answers their seemingly conflicting statements upon classical lore. I do not at this moment remember one single instance, amongst the multitude which Abbé Landriot brings forward, of the favourable expression of Fathers and schoolmen regarding the study of Pagan classics, which cannot, by an application of our formula of the supernatural, be reconciled with (seemingly) conflicting extracts of the "*Ver Rongeur*."

But the question in hand is respecting ourselves—the remedy, not so much for the Naturalism of Protestants whom we cannot reach as of Catholics, whom we can. What is to give Catholic vigour to the rising generation? and what will preserve them against the awful dangers of English society—I not only speak of the rich but of the poor—of all, from the first to the last,—what? I would boldly proclaim to them, with the blast of a trumpet if I could,—*Realize—learn at school to realize—the Supernatural*. I strongly suspect that scholarship will not be the cause of the loss of many souls amongst us just at present; but will not Naturalism? And supposing Pagan classics are too prominent, and absorb precious time which might be better spent, how is this evil first to be seen and then to be remedied? Simply, I say, by realizing the supernatural. The man who realizes the supernatural, truly realizes the divine order of things. He sees the multiplicity of things in the effulgence of one simple Light, which gives them unity, value, and proportion—in *lumine Tuo videbimus lumen*. As one perceives myriads of minute bright points floating in a sunbeam, each gradually sailing and sinking to its level,

according to the simplicity of a single law, so with the acts and the facts of life,—illuminated by the brightness of the supernatural,—each would tend towards its proper place, according to its intrinsic worth in the mind of Him who is the All-Wisdom. For, the light of the supernatural being cast upon the facts and the acts of life, the eyes of the mind can clearly see the direction they are taking under the supreme law, and instead of crushing them or changing their true direction, through the obscurity and darkness of an unilluminated intelligence, it sees them, and each movement of them, so vividly in the light of the supernatural, that the mind has no difficulty in even forecasting their position and anticipating the order that they will occupy, in obedience to the mind of the Creator. Classical studies are one of these facts. Would you know the position they should occupy? Realize the Supernatural. See them in the *Light*: if you venture to move amongst them in the dark, your movements will result in utter confusion and disorder. The supernatural must be realized; for in the supernatural alone is the "*lux vera*" to be found.

*How* to realize the supernatural in detail; how to make it enter into the life of school; how it illuminates the whole course of teaching; how it throws its light upon the relation of master to boy, and of boy to master; how it dictates the conduct of boy to boy; how it gathers into one the whole Catholic system, and gives it a unity which becomes clearer and more developed as the mind expands and feels its way further towards truth; how it explains the system which stands in antagonism to itself, and lights up its hidden darkness, and makes manifest to the intelligence the broad chasm between the two; these are points which would occupy an entire article. Nor have I space left to demonstrate, were it necessary, how it is the specific against the noxious atmosphere of English society; how it sobers the mind, implants in it a sense of responsibility, and tends to make men earnest, devoted, and attached; how it can make them patterns of gentleness, refinement, and nobility, while it sinks the roots of true humility and modesty deep into their souls; how, in a word, it has the power, if applied in its fulness, to cast into shadow the mere veneering and gloss of the superficial education of the present day, and create substantial perfections, founded, not on the frail and perishing foundation of fashion or taste, but on the immutable principles of Christian philosophy: all this, too, perforce, I must for the present leave alone, and rest in the hope that on another opportunity I may be suffered to develop the thoughts which fill my mind.

R. B. V.

## Papal Brief

### IN FAVOUR OF "LA CIVILTÀ CATTOLICA."

**W**E have peculiar pleasure in placing before our readers the following Brief :—

The most weighty office of Our supreme Apostolic ministry absolutely requires that with most intent care we should always provide for the performance of those things, of which we know that they may conduce in any way to promote the cause of the Catholic Church, and the salvation of souls which has been intrusted to us from God by the Lord Christ Himself. Truly, when we were raised to this Chair of Peter, by no merits of our own, but by the secret counsel of Divine Providence, we saw and lamented, with incredible sorrow of soul, the grievous and never sufficiently to be lamented calamities and evils which in these most bitter times are inflicted on the Catholic religion, and on civil society itself, by men who hate all justice and truth, through pestilential books, pamphlets, and especially journals, filled with every most pernicious error and evil doctrine, and written with most bitter and altogether diabolical hatred against our divine religion, and published and disseminated far and wide among the multitude. For this reason, among other things, we did not fail again and again to urge men who were endowed with piety, ability, and sound doctrine, that, principally under the guidance, each man of his own bishop, they should by their writings defend our august religion, refute its assailants, detect, expose, overthrow so many monstrous prodigies of their opinions, and enlighten with truth especially the minds of unwary men and of inexperienced youth, which may be moulded like wax in an evil direction (Alloc. April 20, 1849). And certainly we are

---

**GRAVISSIMUM** supremi Nostri Apostolici ministerii munus omnino postulat ut intentissimo studio ea semper peragenda curemus, quae ad Catholicæ Ecclesiæ causam, animarumque salutem Nobis ab ipso Christo Domino divinitus commissam tuendam quovis modo conducere posse cognoscimus. Incredibili certe animi Nostri moerore, ubi ad hanc Petri Cathedram nullis Nostri meritis, sed arcano divinæ providentiæ consilio, fuimus evecti, vidimus et lamentati sumus maxima et nunquam satis lugenda damna et mala, quae asperrimis hisce temporibus catholice religioni, ac vel ipsi civili societati inferuntur ab omnis iustitiæ ac veritatis osoribus per pestiferos libros, libellos, et præsertim ephemerides perniciosissimis quibusque erroribus, pravisque doctrinis plenissimas, ac acerrimo et plane diabolico contra divinam nostram religionem odio conscriptas, ac longe lateque in vulgus editas, ac disseminatas. Itaque inter alia haud omisimus viros pietate, ingenio, sanaque doctrina præditos etiam atque etiam excitare, ut sub proprii potissimum Antistitis ductu suis scriptis augustinam nostram religionem defenderent, eiusque oppugnatores refutarent, ac tot monstrosa illorum opinionum portenta detegerent, refellerent, profigerent, et incautorum præsertim hominum, ac imperitæ iuventutis cereæ in vitium flecti mentes animosque veritatis lumine illustrarent. (Alloc. die 20 April. 1849.) Ac non mediocri certe afficimur

filled with no small joy, since many men have everywhere arisen who, most willingly obeying these our exhortations, and animated with admirable zeal towards the Catholic Church and this Holy See, do not cease, with honour to their name, to oppose with appropriate writings the most foul stream of so many growing errors and the fatal plague of evil journals, and to defend truth and justice. But, in order that there should ever be certain appointed men who, being heartily devoted to Us and to this Chair of Peter, and eminent for their love of our most holy religion and celebrated for sound and solid doctrine and erudition, may be able to fight the good fight, and by their writings to defend unremittingly Catholic interests and sound doctrine, and to vindicate the same from the fallacies, injustices, and errors of opponents, we desired that certain religious of the illustrious Society of Jesus should constitute a College of Writers, formed of members of that Society, who, by opportune and appropriate writings, should, with skill and learning, confute so many false opinions springing forth from darkness, and should unintermittingly defend with their whole strength the Catholic religion, its doctrine and rights. Which aforesaid religious, most willingly seconding our wishes with all observance and zeal, undertook from that very time (the year 1850) the writing and publishing a journal called "*La Civiltà Cattolica*." And, following the illustrious footsteps of their predecessors, and never sparing care or labour, by means of that journal, diligently and wisely conducted, they had nothing nearer at heart, than by their learned and erudite elucidations manfully to protect and defend the Divine truth of our august religion, and the supreme dignity, authority, power, and interests of this Apostolic See; to teach and propagate true doctrine; to expose and resist particularly the multifold errors of our most unhappy age; its aberrations; its poisoned writings, so pernicious both to

---

laetitia, cum complures ubique surrexerint viri, qui Nostris hisce exhortationibus ac votis perlibenter obsequentes, et egregio erga Catholicam Ecclesiam, et hanc Sanctam Sedem studio animati, idoneis scriptis terribilissimam tot serpentium errorum colluviem, ac funestam pravaram ephemeridum pestem propulsare, et veritatem iustitiamque tutari cum sui nominis laude non desinunt. Ut autem certi semper existerent homines, qui Nobis, et huic Petri Cathedrae ex animo addicti, ac sanctissimae nostrae religionis amore, ac sanae, solidaeque doctrinae, et eruditionis laude spectati valeant bonum certare certamen, suisque scriptis rem catholicam, salutaremque doctrinam continenter tueri, et ab adversariorum fallaciis, iniuriis, et erroribus vindicare; optavimus, ut Religiosi inclytae Societatis Iesu viri Scriptorum Collegium, ex ipsius Societatis Sodalibus conflatum, constituerent, qui opportunis, et aptis scriptis tot falsas ex tenebris emersas doctrinas naviter scienterque confutarent, et catholicam religionem, eiusque doctrinam, ac iura totis viribus indesinenter propugnarent. Qui Religiosi Viri, Nostris desideriis omni observantia et studio quam libentissime obsecundantes, iam inde ab anno 1850 Ephemeridem, cui titulus *La Civiltà Cattolica*, conscribendam, typisque vulgandam susceperunt. Atque illustria maiorum suorum vestigia sectantes, et nullis curis nullisque laboribus unquam parcentes, per eandem Ephemeridem diligenter, sapienterque elaboratam, nihil antiquius habuere, quam doctis, eruditisque suis lucubrationibus divinam augustae nostrae religionis veritatem, ac supremam huius Apostolicae Sedis dignitatem, auctoritatem, potestatem, rationes viriliter tueri, defendere, ac veram doctrinam edocere, propagare, et multi-



Church and State; and to repel the nefarious enterprises of those who endeavour to overthrow (if it were possible), from its very foundation, the Catholic Church and civil society itself. From whence it ensues that the writers of the aforesaid journal have deservedly every day obtained for themselves in a greater degree our good will and high estimation, and the praise of our venerable brethren the bishops, and of [other] most illustrious personages; and that their journal has been, and is, held in the greatest value by all good and right-thinking men. And since from this journal, now sixteen years old, no slight benefits have redounded to the Church and to literature, by God's Help and to our vast joy, therefore it is a matter of our especial desire that so admirable a work should for ever remain in a stable and flourishing state, for the advancement of God's greater glory and the salvation of souls, and for promoting daily more and more a true method of study.

Therefore, by these letters, by Our Apostolic Authority we erect for ever the said Jesuit College of the Writers of the Journal "*La Civiltà Cattolica*," to be fixed in a home peculiar to themselves; and we establish it according to the laws and privileges which other Colleges of the same Society of Jesus possess and enjoy; in such sense, nevertheless, as that the said College must be in all things entirely dependent on the General of the Society. And we decree that the constitution of this College shall be, that those who have been selected by the said General to carry on the said journal or produce other writings, as shall appear more opportune to Ourselves or to the Roman Pontiffs our Successors, must sedulously devote all their labour, industry, and zeal to the composition and publication of writings for the defence of the Catholic religion and this Holy See. For which reason we

plices huius praeicipue infelicissimae nostrae aetatis errores, aberrationes, et venenata scripta cum christianae, tum civili reipublicae tantopere perniciosae detegere, odpugnare, ac nefarios illorum conatus retundere, qui catholicam Ecclesiam, si fieri unquam posset, et civilem ipsam societatem funditus evertere commoliuntur. Ex quo evenit ut commemoratae Ephemeridis Scriptores Nostram benevolentiam, existimationemque, et Venerabilium Fratrum Sacrorum Antistitum, et clarissimorum Virorum laudes sibi quotidie magis merito comparaverint, eorumque Ephemeris a bonis omnibus, ac bene sentientibus viris summo in pretio fuerit habita, et habeatur. Et quoniam ex huiusmodi Ephemeride, sexdecim abhinc annos vigente, non levia in rem christianam, et litterariam rempublicam bona, Deo bene iuvante, cum ingenti animi Nostri gaudio redundarunt; ideoque Nostris in votis omnino est, ut tam praeclarum opus ad maiorem Dei gloriam, animarumque salutem curandam, atque ad rectam studiorum rationem magis in dies iuvandam stabile perpetuo consistat, et efflorescat. Itaque hisce Litteris idem Collegium Societatis Iesu Scriptorum Ephemeridis vulgo *La Civiltà Cattolica* in peculiari ipsis domo habendum Auctoritate Nostra Apostolica, perpetuum in modum erigimus, et constituimus iuxta leges, et privilegia quibus alia eiusdem Societatis Iesu Collegia utuntur, ac fruuntur, ita tamen, ut Collegium idem a Praeposito Generali ipsis Societatis in omnibus pendere plane debeat. Huius autem Collegii institutum esse volumus, ut qui ab ipso Praeposito Generali electi fuerint ad eandem Ephemeridem, vel alia scripta conficienda, prout Nobis, aut Romanis Pontificibus Successoribus Nostris opportunius videbitur, debeant omnem eorum operam, industriam, ac studium sedulo impendere in lucubrandis, edendisque

decree that the same writers continue to dwell in the abode which we have assigned to them in Rome, those conditions being observed which we have prescribed; and this until a more convenient dwelling can be obtained. And we permit to them that, for the fulfilment of their office, they may possess offices for printing, and may print and publish books, and sell them, and spread and disseminate them far and wide over all countries. But the revenues which exist now, or shall exist hereafter, must be devoted to supporting and daily enlarging the same work, in order that a continually greater and stronger force may be employed in opposition to so many and great aggressions of ill-disposed men. But, if it should ever happen in any case that the said College has to depart from this Our city, we will that they may be able to establish themselves in any other city [at the time] more convenient, which may be named by the General of the Society of Jesus with Our consent and that of the Roman Pontiffs our Successors, and there to fulfil their office until (the impediments having been removed) they may be called back by the same General to their ancient home. But if, by chance, no suitable place can be found for prosecuting the work, then we will that both funds and revenues be reserved for promptly renewing the work at the first possible moment. And we grant all these faculties in perpetuity, not only to the present members of the aforesaid College, but to others also who shall be elected by the General in these or future times to perform this same office; reserving to Ourselves and our Successors alone the power of making any change in respect to this College of Writers of the Society of Jesus; such power being entirely refused to all others, of whatever dignity, authority, and degree.

All these things we appoint, will, concede, enjoin, and command; decreeing

---

scriptis pro catholicae religionis, et huius Sanctae Sedis defensione. Quocirca volumus, ut iidem Scriptores pergant habitare in aedibus, quas ipsi in Hospitio hic in Urbe haereticis convertendis iam destinavimus, iis tamen servatis conditionibus, quas praescripsimus, atque id donec opportunior domus comparari queat. Concedimus autem, ut iidem pro sui muneris ratione possint librarías officinas habere, librosque typis in lucem edere, et vendere, ac longe lateque in omnes regiones spargere, ac disseminare. Redditus vero, qui in praesentia sunt, quique in posterum esse poterunt, ad opus idem sustentandum, ac magis in dies amplificandum adhiberi debent, ut tot tantisque inimicorum hominum aggressionibus ampliora semper, ac validiora obiciantur praesidia. Quod si unquam quocumque casu contigerit, ut eidem Scriptorum Collegio ab hac alma Urbe Nostra sit recedendum, volumus, ut ipsi in alia qualibet opportuniore civitate a Praeposito Societatis Iesu Generali cum Nostro, et Romanorum Pontificum Successorum Nostrorum consensu statuenda, possint consistere, ibique summi munus obire, quoad amotis impedimentis in pristinam Sedem ab eodem Praeposito Generali revocentur. Si autem nullus forte opportunus locus operi prosequendo reperiatur, volumus, ut tum fundi, tum redditus in eandem operam reserventur, mature instaurandam, ubi primum licuerit. Atque has omnes facultates non solum praesentibus commemorati Collegii Sociis, verum etiam aliis, qui a Praeposito Generali ad idem munus obeundum hoc, futurisque temporibus deligentur, perpetuum in modum concedimus, reservata Nobis, ac Successoribus Nostris dumtaxat facultate aliquid circa idem Societatis Iesu Scriptorum Collegium immutandi, et aliis omnibus cuiusque dignitatis, auctoritatis, et gradus penitus interdicta.

that these our letters and all things therein contained—not even on the ground that any men interested, or professing to be so, have not been called and heard, nor agreed to the foregoing,—can ever be noted or impugned for defect of subreption or obreption, or for nullity, or for fault of our intention or for any other substantial defect; nor otherwise infringed, suspended, limited, or called into controversy; &c., &c.

Given at Rome, at S. Peter's, under the Fisherman's ring, Feb. 12, 1866, in the twentieth year of Our Pontificate.

---

We hope in our next number to give a general account of the *Civiltà Cattolica*, of its history, and of the important work which it has accomplished and is accomplishing. Meanwhile, we must not delay for one quarter to draw attention to the Holy Father's express judgment, that the journal in question "has been and is held in the greatest value by all good and right-thinking men." We have a personal reason for drawing attention to this. No one can have read the extracts from the *Civiltà*, which have from time to time appeared under our head of "Foreign Periodical Literature," without observing that its principles are precisely identical with those, on which we endeavour consistently to conduct this review. In further illustration of this, we insert the following passage, which appears in the very number of the *Civiltà* containing the Papal Brief.

"To Christianize liberalism! Such is surely a flight of fancy higher than Pindaric! . . . . In what manner do you think of making liberalism Christian, and on good terms with the Pope? Certainly [you can only do so] by inducing it fully to admit the *Syllabus*, and condemn all the errors therein prescribed. . . . . You think then of inducing it to condemn civil marriage (prop. lxxiii.), accomplished facts (lix.), non-intervention (lxii.), liberty of worship (lxxvii.), liberty of thought and of the press (lxxix.), separation of the State from the Church (lv.). . . . . Liberalism does not consist in having a fundamental constitution, and the institutions of representative government. If there were only question of that, there would be no difficulty in being at once Catholic and liberal; so only that the constitution were in conformity with evangelical principles, and the national representatives were jealous in observing the same. The Church is indifferent towards any particular form of political government, so only it be legitimate in origin and just in operation" (pp. 29, 30).

---

Haec omnia statuimus, volumus, concedimus, praecipimus, atque mandamus, decernentes has Nostras Litteras, et in eis contenta quaecumque, etiam ex eo quod quilibet interesse habentes, vel habere praetendentes vocati, et auditi non fuerint, ac praemissis non consenserint, nullo unquam tempore de subreptionis, vel obreptionis, aut nullitatis, seu intentionis Nostrae vitio, vel alio quolibet etiam substantiali defectu notari, impugnari, aut alias infringi, suspendi, restringi, limitari, vel in controversiam vocari, &c., &c.

## Notices of Books.

---

*The Anglican Theory of Unity.* A Second Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of Birmingham. By the Right Rev. Bishop ULLATHORNE. London : Burns & Co.

IT is a very unusual circumstance that two works should be simultaneously going through the press, so strikingly similar in great part of their argument, as this work and the pamphlet of Mr. Allies, which we noticed by anticipation in our last number. The bishop's argument is in fact simply identical with Mr. Allies's, so far as he is occupied with assailing Dr. Pusey's miserable view of ecclesiastical unity, and miserable attempt to defend that view by the precedent of S. Augustine. Yet even on this head he puts forth one or two very important criticisms of the Eirenicon, which had not occurred to Mr. Allies. The following, *e.g.*, is the first Catholic comment which we happen to have seen, on the most fundamental of all Dr. Pusey's errors concerning the Church's constitution ; nor can anything be more forcibly thought and expressed.

"But Dr. Pusey separates these attributes, and constructs four Churches from them, of which one is invisible, and three are visible. To the one Church he ascribes holiness and universality ; to the three he attributes Apostolicity. Thus he not only divides Apostolicity from being commensurate with the One Catholic Church, but he divides Apostolicity itself, and distributes that qualification into three separate communions. Thus his theory is an eclecticism from the doctrines of the Low and the High Church parties of Anglicanism—an attempt to reconcile the two at the cost of the Creeds. His sympathy with the Evangelicals he does not merely leave us to conjecture ; he tells us plainly : 'I believe them to be "of the truth." I have ever believed, and believe, that their faith was, and is, on some points of doctrine, much truer than their words.' He accordingly adopts their theory of an invisible Church" (p. 16).

The Bishop is also the first Catholic critic who has exposed the miserable subjectivity of Dr. Pusey's scheme ; its practical and virtual overthrow of all ecclesiastical organization whatever.

"Little can the advocates of this system have reflected how often, and under what circumstances, this theory of a spiritual Church has been raised ; or what fanaticism, what spiritual self-inebriating and bitter pride it has called up ; or what social as well as moral disorders it has engendered and justified. It has been the invariable refuge of those sects which have assaulted the Apostolic ministry of the Church with unrelenting hostility ; and

if the Unionists wished to destroy instead of reuniting those three visible communions, they could take no more effectual way than by inculcating that the One Catholic Church of Christ consists only of spiritual lovers, receiving all their gifts directly from God. They may strive to check the consequences by urging the necessity of some visible Apostolic ministry as a medium of grace; but others will not consider themselves bound to follow them into this part of their theory. Even Dr. Pusey has himself travelled beyond its bounds" (pp. 26-27).

And the author then proceeds to cite Dr. Pusey's portentous suggestion, that "Presbyterians have what *they* believe, we what *we* believe;" as though all men as a matter of course possessed every spiritual privilege which they *believe* themselves to possess.

On the argument from S. Augustine we will not here speak at length, because we commented on it in our notice of Mr. Allies. We will only repeat what we said on that occasion: viz., that Dr. Pusey is imperatively called on, either to meet the very direct and heavy blows dealt by the Bishop, or else to admit (what at last cannot possibly be denied) that his whole reasoning on the African Church is one mass of worthless sophistry.

The following remarks are especially opportune at the present time, when doctrines most unquestionably Catholic are again and again assailed as "extreme" and as characteristic of a "party."

"Let me, before proceeding, take note of this abuse of the word *Ultramontane*. It is here put offensively for the whole Catholic communion; and I am sorry to see Dr. Pusey guilty of the same offensiveness in sundry places. As a controversial trick, it is simply unworthy; a sort of substitution for the word *Papery*, which last has grown vulgar. The word *Ultramontane* has a definite theological sense as opposed to the word *Gallicanism*. It bears exclusively upon particular questions relating to the prerogatives of the Sovereign Pontiff. It is unfair and ungenerous to speak of doctrines as Ultramontane, or as held by Ultramontanians, which are universally held in the Catholic and Roman communion; thus leaving the effect of an insinuation that they are the doctrines of some party amongst us. Even that antagonism which existed between Gallicanism and Ultramontanism, as it stood on its own special ground in the seventeenth century, exists no more. It was mainly owing to the French Court, its courtiers and lawyers. Pascal himself, during the height of the combat, could not help noticing, that '*Scarcely anywhere except in France* is it allowable in these days to say that the Council is above the Pope.' Gallicanism, as claiming an exceptional condition for France, died with the old régime. Napoleon reasserted its principles in the Organic Articles; a gross fraud upon the Concordat, which has only served to keep alive a strenuous resistance to their authority, as well on the part of the French Church, as on that of the Sovereign Pontiff. Even the prerogatives of the Holy See, as they are universally believed throughout the Catholic Church, are not of Ultramontane but of Catholic doctrine" (p. 36, 7).

Again,—

"There is no occasion for going further to show what the Unionists mean by the 'Œcumenical intercommunion which was existing before the division of East and West.' They mean that the Pope should cease from being Pope. We also understand why these writers love to call us Catholics Ultramon-

tales ; it means that we are Papists. And this association turns out, in effect, to be a society of *prayer for the cessation of that supremacy which our Lord established in Peter. Exeter Hall is nothing else.*"

We are very grateful also to the author for making us acquainted with the admirably-reasoned passage from F. Lacordaire, which is inserted from p. 93 to p. 95.

Our readers may remember Dr. Littledale's language in regard to the first Roman decree against the A. P. U. C. He said that that decree "was obtained by the intrigues of three or four well-known converts," especially that "master of the art of suppression and mis-statement," Mgr. Manning. It now appears that, whether or no Dr. Littledale knew better when he thus wrote, at all events the secretary of the A. P. U. C. was at that time well aware how absolutely unfounded was the notion of Mgr. Manning having had anything whatever to do with the matter. The Bishop had told him, as he now tells the world (p. 5), that the Roman decree originated with Cardinal Wiseman and with the Bishop himself, who, with unanimous episcopal approval, had addressed the Holy See for instructions on the subject. The Bishop has made no comment on Dr. Littledale's mis-statement. We suppose he thought that the only reasonable comment would be a more severe one than he chose to place on permanent and public record.

With a surprise which we cannot express, we have seen it recently stated by a Catholic writer that the condemnation of the A. P. U. C. was based, not on the essentially anti-Catholic principle of that association, but on the tone and temper of the *Union Review*. This is simply to say, in other words, that the Roman congregation professed one ground, but acted on another totally different. The various extravagant statements, of which this is a specimen, do but show more impressively how distinct and unmistakeable has been the ecclesiastical condemnation of the association ; and all Catholics owe a heavy debt of gratitude to Bishop Ullathorne, for the attitude of opposition which he has so consistently maintained from the very first.

*The Second Eve, or the Mother of Life.* By V. DECHAMPS, Bishop of Namur. Authorized Translation. London : Burns & Co.

PERHAPS English Catholics are indebted for this volume to the Eirenicon. We know the case of one person many years ago, then on her way to the Church, who was goaded (as it were) into saying her first "Hail Mary," by way of reparation for the shocking insults on our Lady which she heard uttered by a Protestant bishop. In like manner there is more than one person, to our certain knowledge, and we believe there are several, who have been driven, by Dr. Pusey's irreverence, to study S. Alphonsus and Montfort with far greater zest and far more hearty appreciation than ever before. It must not, of course, be forgotten that Mgr. Dechamps is one of S. Alphonsus's spiritual children, and therefore an



enthusiast in his defence. Still, after reading Dr. Pusey, it is almost diverting to find the "Glories of Mary" thus spoken of. "This is my spiritual thermometer," said a friend to the author; "when I am careless and lukewarm, the treatise no longer suits me; but when the eye of my soul is restored to its strength and purity, it finds itself in union with this precious book" (p. xii.). The author, indeed, does not agree with this opinion; but his disagreement arises from his thinking such praise too little. "Experience proves daily that the 'Glories of Mary' touches sinners and brings them back to God," no less truly than it edifies those who are interior and saintly.

M<sup>r</sup>. Dechamps's own work, however, is on a different plan from the "Glories of Mary," being far more doctrinal and systematic. A careful dogmatic foundation is laid down for the whole devotional superstructure; and we fancy that several readers may find the present volume most interesting and satisfactory, who do not value the "Glories of Mary" as that admirable treatise deserves. In fact, the Bishop of Namur has made every chapter a brief dogmatic essay, closed by a suitable prayer.

We need hardly mention—the Bishop being a Redemptorist—that his devotion appertains throughout to that "extreme" or Alphonsine type, with which we are ourselves far more in sympathy than with any other. He quotes Gregory XVI. as pronouncing that S. Alphonsus himself "shines among the greatest luminaries of the Church" (p. 89). "*How blind do those appear, oh Lord, who fear to say too much of thy Mother!*" (p. 27). "The more faithfully we follow the Divine order by constantly approaching Him by the blessed medium of His Mother, the more shall we find our prayers increase in the confidence which renders them efficacious. . . . Do we go less directly to God by going in company with His Mother?" (p. 96). "Let us venerate Mary with all the powers of our soul and all the affections of our heart" (p. 98). "*There is nothing which we may not hope from a heart which is faithful to this devotion—a heart which does not lose hold of that merciful chain by which God has bound the hearts of His prodigal children in all ages to Himself. No wonder, then, that theologians give devotion to Mary as one of the most certain signs of predestination*" (p. 192). S. Stanislaus Kotska "never began any action without first turning to an image of Mary to ask her blessing" (p. 198). "The Son, Omnipotent by nature, has made His Mother omnipotent by grace" (p. 204). And the calm, scientific tone in which the volume is written adds threefold force to such expressions.

The translation is beautifully executed; and we have to express our heartfelt gratitude for the boon bestowed by it on English Catholics.

---

*Cardinal Wiseman and Bishop Challoner.* By Rev. J. SIDDEN. London: Richardson.

**M**R. SIDDEN writes in a most genial and kindly spirit, and has a good word for every one. Nor can anything be more excellent than the purpose of his pamphlet. He thinks that many Anglicans are now fully

prepared to become Catholics, were they not deterred by their alarm of "Mariolatry;" and he wishes to show them that their alarm is groundless.

But, although we cannot but profoundly respect both Mr. Sidden's character and his intentions, we are obliged, nevertheless, to think the means adopted by him entirely inappropriate to his end. He aims, of course, at influencing—not violent fanatics—but pious, intelligent, and candid Anglicans: yet the truths on which he lays stress are such, that no men of this kind ever doubted them. He points out (p. 6) that S. Alphonsus's extreme expressions, "however misintelligible by English separatists, bear a truly Christian and devout sense;" and he also explains that, according to the belief of every Catholic, our Lady can no otherwise benefit us than by her prayers. But surely it is only the more violent and prejudiced of Protestants, who have any *doubt* on these two facts; and the stumbling-block of candid and intelligent Anglicans is something quite different. They would probably have no great objection to our addressing the most Blessed Virgin from time to time, with a view to obtaining her prayers. What alarms them, is the prominent position held by her in the mind of devout Catholics; the extremely important place assigned to her worship in the whole interior life; the constant and (as it were) indissoluble union between the thought of her and of her Son. For instance (see p. 146 of our present number), prayers indulgenced by successive Popes use such expressions as these:—"I give thee [Mary] all myself;" "I consecrate myself to thee without reserve;" "O Joseph, obtain for us that we may be entirely devoted to the service of *Jesus and Mary*." As Dr. Pusey has urged again and again, all this is quite different *in kind* from a mere practice of occasionally asking her to intercede for us; and we do not see that Mr. Sidden has said one word to remove this difficulty.

The real question for a Catholic's consideration is surely this:—Does the Church, or does she not, counsel the habitual and (as it were) unintermittent thought and remembrance of the Most Holy Virgin? Is such thought and remembrance, or is it not, an invaluable means of grace? Does it, or does it not, give extraordinary help in acquiring a true love for her Son? If it does not, then surely—considering the frightful prejudice excited in the non-Catholic mind by Marian devotions—it is the dictate of charity greatly to curtail and pare down those devotions; to cease from observing the Month of Mary; to exhibit her images far less conspicuously in our churches; &c., &c. And this, as we shall immediately see, is Mr. Sidden's own practical conclusion. But if, on the contrary, the preceding question should be answered in the affirmative, then a Catholic will regard Anglican objections to his worship of Mary, just as he regards Unitarian objections to his worship of Jesus.

Mr. Sidden, we say, does not explicitly treat the preceding question at all; but implicitly he answers it in the negative. "Let us not needlessly add," he says (p. 12), "to the unreasoning fears of our Protestant fellow-countrymen; let us, in all uncommanded forms of worship or devotion in public, *charitably refrain from much that, not being necessary for ourselves, might tend to detain our neighbours in a mere fragmentary Christianity*" (p. 13). He cannot of course mean that, for the sake of not shocking Protestants, we

should abstain from pressing forward a devotion, eminently conducive to the love of God and of Christ; and he must hold, therefore, that habitual and unintermitting devotion to our Blessed Lady is *not* thus conducive. We are not here arguing against this opinion: we are only pointing out that such is the real question at issue, and that Mr. Sidden nowhere confronts it.

We will make one final observation. Let us here assume, that the true answer to this question is contradictory to that implied by Mr. Sidden; and let us suppose accordingly, that a number of interior and fervent souls do fix their thoughts constantly on Mary. Their devout meditations will indefinitely differ from each other, according to the circumstances of personal or national character; of education; of intellectual power; of accidental habit; and the like: but in one point, rely on it, they will all agree; viz., in being unspeakably startling and repulsive to an ordinary Anglican. It is not the *particular shape* into which S. Alphonsus and Montfort have thrown their reflections, that repels such men as Dr. Pusey; for no two shapes can be more extremely different. It is not because they are foreigners and he an Englishman, that he finds their devotions so absolutely intolerable. It is because their thoughts in any shape are fixed so constantly, intently, reverently, on a creature. Between him and devout worshippers of Mary lies a broad gulf of doctrinal separation; and we cannot think that Mr. Sidden's pamphlet will give him any help for crossing it.

We have been the more full in noticing this short pamphlet, because we think that some such method of meeting Protestant objections finds favour with various excellently-intentioned Catholics; and because we are convinced that it must totally fail. It does not deserve success, because it is altogether fallacious; and it will not obtain success, because it is keenly felt by all Protestants to evade their real difficulty.

*Fortnightly Review* for June 15th, Art. 3. London: Chapman & Hall.

IT is certainly a curious proof how large a portion of the English public now gives its attention to theology in general, and to the Unionist movement in particular, when we find even the *Fortnightly Review* devoting an article to the subject. This is written by the Rev. W. Kirkus. Its purpose is to show that "Romanism, Anglicanism, and Evangelicalism" are "logically identical," as being based on the common principle of authoritative dogma; and that what Catholics calls rationalism is the only form of religion which can be reasonably embraced. We can see no traces whatever of intellectual ability in the article; nor have we observed in it one new remark. We should not therefore have thought of noticing it, except for two reasons.

(1) We have maintained all along in this Review that Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon* itself—as distinct from its author's personal intentions—is imbued with a most unfriendly spirit towards the Roman Catholic Church. Mr. Kirkus, an impartial witness, is explicit on this head.

"For many a long year to come the '*Eirenicon*' will be one of the best-furnished armouries for those who wish and endeavour to *bring about* the

*destruction of the Church of Rome.* It is scarcely too much to say that no book written within the present century has so completely demonstrated the hideous, not to say blasphemous, character of popular Romanism" (p. 285).

(2) Mr. Kirkus adds on his own account that "no Protestant need hesitate to denounce with the utmost severity such extravagances of Mariolatry as are quoted in the *Eirenicon*, when even Dr. Newman himself can only speak of them in such terms as these;" and then follows a well-known passage from F. Newman's letter to Dr. Pusey. But the passage itself, as it stands in Mr. Kirkus's own article, testifies the erroneousness of Mr. Kirkus's statement. F. Newman does not admit in that passage at all, that the writers cited by Dr. Pusey have uttered any "extravagances." On the contrary—as has been more than once pointed out in the *Month*—he expresses his conviction that the writers "did not use such sentences and phrases in their literal and absolute sense;" nor will he speak unfavourably of "these statements as they are found in their authors," because he believes that those authors "have not meant" what Dr. Pusey supposes. We are the more anxious to point this out, because more than one Protestant writer has carelessly overlooked this most important explanation, given by F. Newman himself of his own meaning.

---

*Etudes Religieuses Historiques et Littéraires*, Juin, 1866. Paris: Albanel.

THE *Etudes* for January, February, and March contained three communicated papers on the *Eirenicon*, with many parts of which we were ourselves totally out of sympathy. It was expressed, however, both in the January and February numbers, that "la direction" was by no means identified with these papers; and we observe with great satisfaction that the present number commences a series of articles on the *Eirenicon*, which promises to be of considerable value. The particular doctrine to be treated is that of ecclesiastical unity; and the first article examines very satisfactorily the question of S. Victor and the Quartodecimans. We hope to avail ourselves of these articles, when our own controversy with Dr. Pusey reaches the question of Papal Supremacy.

---

*Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon considered in relation to Catholic Unity.* By H. N. OXENHAM, M. A. London: Longmans.

THE Unionist party seems always profoundly unconscious, that those writers most opposed to it are no less keenly desirous for the reunion of Christendom, than is the Unionist party itself. One would have thought it impossible, after the Archbishop's Pastoral, that this misconception should continue; but here is Mr. Oxenham exhibiting it again in its full extravagance. We cannot, then, express our judgment on his pamphlet, till we have made this matter clear. Those Catholics from whom Mr. Oxenham most violently dissents, hold such opinions as the following:—

The Church is infallible, not only as "testis" and "judex," but equally as

"magistra." The one appointed way for learning the true road to sanctification and salvation, is the inquiring into her true mind and her practical teaching. It is true that, in this or that local church of this or that particular period, the Catholic magisterium may be less fully and purely exhibited than elsewhere; but this is always because the influence of Rome is there less pervasive and dominant. If, then, those Catholics are to be pitied who have been educated where the Holy See has less influence, how far more deplorable is *their* lot who are actually external to its communion. As a matter of mere Christian charity, one cannot be too zealous,—by argument, explanation, and every other available means,—in placing emphatically and convincingly, both before Catholics and Protestants, the divinely-given prerogatives and privileges of Rome. And further, were a considerable approach really made to the reunion of Christendom, such approach would be unspeakably beneficial, not only to the individual souls newly imbued with knowledge of the Truth, but to the whole Church; nay, and to the whole world. Once let all earnest religion be fully and purely Catholic, the advantage would be quite inappreciable, as regards whether the sanctification of individuals, or the Church's influence over mankind in general. So vast, indeed, is this advantage, that in every country where Catholic unity exists, the civil power should use the material force at its command, for the purpose of preserving that unity free from aggression and interruption.

Such is the language which has been used age after age by orthodox and saintly Catholics; and no one can say that such aspirations after unity are less keen, than those exhibited by Mr. Oxenham. His own view may be expressed somewhat as follows; though of course he is not responsible for an opponent's wording of it:—

"The Church is infallible in her definitions of faith, but her infallibility extends no further. As regards all external to these, the Church's prevalent opinion is left by God to depend on purely human and secondary causes. Here we see a peculiar evil, which has resulted from the divisions of Christendom. The Church's *practical teaching*, as distinct from her decrees of faith, depends for its purity, not on God's promises to S. Peter's Chair, but on the free and mutually corrective admixture of conflicting elements. And by consequence the comparative absence of the Teutonic race for so many centuries, has been a fruitful source of corruption as to the doctrine practically taught. The reunion of Christendom then is eminently desirable, as for other reasons, so also in order that a more healthy spirit may animate the Church. Catholics have almost as much to learn from Protestants, as these from Catholics."

Now we are the very last to under-estimate the contrast between this view and our own: but it is evidently monstrous to speak as though this difference turned, in any degree whatever, on a greater or less desire of Christian reunion. It turns on a question absolutely and totally distinct; viz., the divinely-given privileges of the Church in general, and of Rome in particular. It is a curious instance, then, of Mr. Oxenham's characteristic mistiness, that there is no profession of reasoning, throughout his pamphlet, as to those most serious questions which are really at issue between him and his Catholic

opponents. He does not argue at all, except for conclusions, which his opponents either themselves heartily embrace or at least regard as undeserving of any censure. For instance. By far the most systematic course of argument in his whole pamphlet, and, we think, in every respect the ablest portion of it, is from p. 67 to p. 85; and to what conclusion does that argument professedly tend? To the conclusion that inappreciable blessings would ensue if Christendom were reunited. What imaginable opponent is he dreaming of? Who is there that ever doubted this conclusion? We cannot, indeed, concur with every individual expression contained in these pages; but, on the whole, we can sincerely recommend them to our readers: for very great benefit often arises from being practically reminded of truths, which speculatively no one ever thought of denying. Mr. Oxenham points out with undeniable force the vast benefits which would accrue if "the religious energies of Christendom were concentrated on a common purpose and a common truth" (p. 68); if Catholics could devote themselves exclusively to an appreciation and remedy of evils existing within the Church, instead of having also to defend her against the attack of enemies (p. 71); if Christendom in its visible unity could be a public witness to the heathen (p. 74); if Christians in England could combine against the frightful social evils under which their country groans (p. 76); if they could more unitedly contend against scepticism (p. 79); and if those impediments to holiness were removed, which are so largely engendered by the "religious esprit de corps," "obtruded" as it is "in its least amiable form" (p. 80). And, for our own part, God forbid we should raise the cry of "visionary," "Quixotic," "enthusiast" (p. 83), against any number of men who should make it their real practical end to labour against all those frightful evils which flow from disunion. How strange Mr. Oxenham should not see, that all this is common ground between him and ourselves! The one point really at issue is this; whether Christian union is to be sought in the way of absolute and unreserved submission to the Holy See—to all its formal utterances, and to its whole practical magisterium,—or by some different method which Mr. Oxenham is to explain. But on *this* question, not one single syllable of elucidation or argument does he attempt from first to last. He well knows the low opinion which we have formed of him as a thinker and a reasoner: here is an excellent opportunity presented him, both for rebuking us and for proving himself to possess that ability which we do not ascribe to him. He has not even taken the trouble to glance at the argument which has been drawn out in this Review, for the infallibility of Papal Allocutions and Encyclicals.\* Let him fairly confront that argument and attempt an answer.

---

\* We say that he has not even glanced at our argument, for this reason:—He considers us to hold (p. 45, note) that "every passing and incidental expression in such documents is verbally inspired;" whereas if he had so much as glanced at any one thing we have written on the subject, he would have seen that we regard such "incidental expressions" not only as not "verbally inspired," but not even as in substance infallibly true. We have quite invariably confined the claim of infallibility to those doctrinal instructions which are *directly* conveyed, as *distinct* from "passing and incidental expressions."



And this will be a good place for saying whatever is necessary, on his various criticisms of this Review. Thus (p. 44) he supposes that Dr. Pusey has protested against some particular doctrine of Papal infallibility, put forth in this Review; whereas in every case Dr. Pusey protested, not against any claim put forth in this Review, but against the claims put forth by the Pope himself. Mr. Oxenham's misapprehension is the more unaccountable, because he expressly cites (p. 44, note) two distinct passages of the Eirenicon; and the language of both is quite unmistakeable. In p. 290 Dr. Pusey speaks of "the claim now raised" by "*the Encyclical of 1864*" (p. 289); adding (*ib.*) that the DUBLIN REVIEW has shown such claim to have been really made by that Encyclical. And in p. 303, which Mr. Oxenham also cites, Dr. Pusey is not alluding to this Review ever so distantly; but speaking of "the infallibility claimed" for Papal decrees by the recent *Syllabus*. Nay, in a note at the preceding page, Dr. Pusey actually complains of this Review, as *understating* the doctrine put forth by Pius IX. on his civil principedom. Lastly, no one, who fairly examines Dr. Pusey's citations, will doubt that the Pope does claim the fullest extent of infallibility which we have ever ascribed to him. Consequently the "strange assertions" and "startling eccentricities," on which Mr. Oxenham comments (p. 44), are nothing less than the authoritative declarations of that Pontiff who has been appointed by God as "the teacher of all Christians." The authoritative teaching, we say, of Pius IX. is denounced by Mr. Oxenham as a "startling eccentricity."

Mr. Oxenham also comments (p. 39) on our "somewhat tardy admission" that this Review "is now a purely private and unofficial periodical." What are the facts? In January we said accidentally that when it was the admitted organ of Cardinal Wiseman, it had more claim on Dr. Pusey's attention than in its present "purely private and unofficial" position. A correspondent of the *Weekly Register* drew attention to this statement, and added that a different impression had been widely prevalent as to this Review's real character. The Editor wrote that very week to the *Register*, stating that he had had no idea before of such a misconception existing; and that otherwise he should have contradicted it far more emphatically. An explanation is not usually considered "tardy," which is put forth the very moment one hears of the misunderstanding; but in this case we accidentally made it even at a somewhat earlier period.

In other particulars Mr. Oxenham's language about this Review exemplifies a general and important truth. His notion of large-mindedness, is to see indefinite good in almost every form of religious error external to the Church; and to regard one set of opinions, almost alone, as simply contemptible and detestable: that one excepted class consisting of Catholics, who profess unreserved submission to the Holy Father's authoritative teaching. In behalf of those whom he somewhere calls "Roman Ultramontanes," he has not one syllable of sympathy or extenuation. He expresses his "conviction" (p. 12) that Anglican liberalism "will find not only its needful corrective, but a place and a home in a reunited Christendom:" but he has nowhere attempted to explain how such a Church as he desires is to contain those who sincerely hold Ultramontane doctrine. He concurs in the proposition that

the language of the Ven. Grignon de Montfort is "mischievous and heretical;" though he qualifies his concurrence by an admission that it is not so in the sense intended by the writer (p. 42). Thus Mr. Oxenham speaks of language, which has been authoritatively decided at Rome to be free from anything theologically censurable; such is his sympathy with error, and such his antipathy to the Truth. And so it has ever been. All forms of error ever gravitate towards each other; while they are ever intolerant of the one exclusive Truth.

But this assumption of large-minded appreciation on which we have just spoken, is surely not less unreal than it is offensive. In p. 85, note, he quotes from Mr. Lecky a statement, as being substantially true though exaggerated, that "the very men who would once have been conspicuous saints are now conspicuous revolutionists." He then proceeds on his own account to improve on Mr. Lecky, by adding that "there are points of contact between the characters of *S. Bernard and Garibaldi*;" and further that the atheist "*Shelley had the making of a saint in him.*" We do Mr. Oxenham the justice to believe, that he uses such words with the view of exhibiting his large-mindedness, but with no definite meaning.

There is one other conclusion, in addition to that mentioned in the earlier part of our notice, for which Mr. Oxenham does argue; viz., that various parties in the Church of England are far better disposed towards Catholicism, than appears on the surface. We think his remarks on that head undeviatingly crude, shallow, and feeble in the extreme; but we have no room left for replying to them. The question is a perfectly open one; and any Catholics might go Mr. Oxenham's whole length in a hopeful view of Anglicanism, without being at all mixed up with his theological errors. Cardinal Wiseman, *e.g.*, as Mr. Oxenham has pointed out, at one time of his life entertained so sanguine a view, as to astound the present writer even when himself an Anglican; and which appears on retrospection even more marvellous than it appeared then. But Mr. Oxenham has not shown, nor can he by possibility show, that the Cardinal expressed any idea by the term "union," except that of the most absolutely unreserved submission to the Holy See. There is no good Catholic, then, who would not be delighted, if he could bring himself to believe that the Cardinal's sanguine anticipations were really based on solid fact.

As to this matter, then, we will make but two comments on Mr. Oxenham. Firstly, even if the Anglican clergy and laity were as much inclined as he supposes towards "reunion" in *his* sense,—it by no means follows that they are disposed to that humble and unconditional submission, which is really exacted of them by the Church. Secondly, Mr. Oxenham's great Anglican authority is throughout Dr. Pusey. Now, only two years ago Dr. Pusey so desponded on the prospects of his own communion, that he meditated secession from the Establishment.

However, it would be, of course, a simple happiness to any good Catholic, if he could believe that submission to the Church throughout England is probable on a large scale. The project of *corporate* union stands on totally different ground. In this Review we have again and again expressed one simple objection to it. God has imposed on all men a precept of submitting

unreservedly to the Roman Catholic Church. This precept binds all without exception who have means of knowing it; or in other words, no individual is dispensed from it except by invincible ignorance of its existence. Nor, on the other hand, can any man be admitted into the Catholic Church, until he believes that this precept has been given. Suppose an Anglican bishop becomes convinced that this precept *has* been imposed. Would Mr. Oxenham have him dissemble his conviction, and continue to exercise episcopal functions in a society which he now knows to be schismatical? Such a proposal Mr. Oxenham would undoubtedly stigmatize as un-English; but we hope he would also pronounce on it the immeasurably more important censure of its being un-Christian. Unless, therefore, you suppose wholesale episcopal hypocrisy, and that of the most frightful character, the prospect of corporate reunion resolves itself into this. Mr. Oxenham must expect that, some day or other, a large majority of Anglican bishops, with a great number of clergy and laity, shall be struck at one and the same moment, as by a light from heaven, with the sudden conviction that this precept of submission has been imposed by God. Even then one does not see what advantage would be gained by their submission being made collectively rather than successively. But to anticipate corporate reunion, is to anticipate either that God will work an astounding and most unprecedented miracle, or else that a number of Protestant bishops and clergy shall be guilty of the basest treachery and hypocrisy. We have urged this argument again and again in former numbers; and this being a particular on which reasoning is really needed, is of course one on which Mr. Oxenham has not attempted to reason.

We will conclude by animadverting on three isolated theological statements.

1. "When Anglicans become aware how completely the recent definition" of the Immaculate Conception, "— apart from any question about the binding authority of Papal Bulls as such,—was *endorsed*, or rather anticipated, by the verdict of the *sensus fidelium*, they will not be unwilling to accept" it "as a doctrine" (p. 54). Certainly Mr. Oxenham has liberty to think that the Papal definition of this doctrine was not infallible, apart from episcopal assent. But the above words contain no reference whatever to the Catholic Episcopate; and most persons will understand them as implying, that the "endorsement" of the *sensus fidelium* is requisite as a condition of infallibility. Mr. Oxenham, of course, cannot intend this, because he is a Catholic; but we wish he had not expressed himself in words so open to misapprehension. As it is, we cannot even conjecture his meaning.

2. Mr. Oxenham considers (p. 81) that the Photian schism was "the first great schism which rent the unity of Christendom," and the Reformation the second. Such language is most intelligible from an Anglican Unionist; for he thinks that on both these occasions true branches of the Church began to remain separate from each other. But what can Mr. Oxenham possibly mean by the statement? Was not the Arian heresy a fearful "rent in the unity of Christendom?" and the Nestorian? and the many branches of the Eutychian? And did not all these precede the Photian?

3. Mr. Oxenham (p. 45) expresses agreement with an opinion that "the

Church Catholic acknowledges no other authoritative standards of teaching than . . . General Councils." He regards it, no doubt, as of small account, that this error has been expressly condemned in the Munich Brief; yet in the present case, at all events, deference to Papal authority would have saved him from a palpable blunder. For it follows from such a view, that during the first three hundred years of her existence the Church had no "authoritative standard of teaching" whatever: except, indeed, on any doctrinal matter decided in the Apostolic Council of Jerusalem.

Here we close our remarks. On the personal characteristics displayed in this pamphlet, we purposely abstain from expressing any opinion.

*Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon.* A Review, by GERALD MOLLOY, D.D., Professor of Theology at St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. London: Longmans.

THIS is the reprint of an article which has appeared in the "Irish Ecclesiastical Record." We most heartily recommend it to our readers; for while its tone is most courteous, its principles are most Catholic, and its arguments most forcible.

In regard to Dr. Pusey's Marian citations, Dr. Molloy points out that no one who has been educated a Catholic can by possibility misunderstand "ambiguous or exaggerated" phrases, even should he meet with such in Catholic writers; because "it has been *engraved on his mind from earliest infancy* as the fixed unalterable teaching of the Catholic Church," that "the honour which is due to the Blessed Virgin is very different in kind from the honour which is due to God" (p. 22). And in his whole treatment of this delicate subject, the author, we think, exactly hits the happy mean. On the one hand he has no wish to extenuate any doctrinal error which the Church may have condemned; but, on the other hand, he does justice to "the depth and tenderness of devotion" (p. 22), which are Mary's due, and rejoices that a Catholic should "rush eagerly to her as a child to the embraces of his mother," interchanging with her "fond endearments" (p. 21).

On the infallibility question Dr. Molloy is equally satisfactory. He maintains confidently (p. 16) that the Church is infallible, not only in her formal decrees, but in her whole practical teaching; nor have we anywhere seen this doctrine more clearly expressed in a few words. As regards her formal decrees themselves, he protests against Dr. Pusey's notion that any Catholics consider her to be infallible "in the *incidental statements*, or the *arguments*, even of a dogmatic bull" (p. 34). Again, no pronouncement can be considered infallible even in substance, "unless it treats of some question which appertains to faith, [directly or indirectly] and unless it be addressed [in effect] to the universal Church" (p. 32).

So much on the "object" of infallibility. As regards its "subject," Dr. Molloy considers that "the belief" in *Papal* infallibility "is now very general in the Church, and that it may possibly become at some future period *the subject of a formal definition*" (pp. 29, 30). God grant this in His own good time!

*The First Age of Christianity and the Church.* By JOHN IGNATIUS DÖLLINGER, D.D. Translated by HENRY NUTCOMBE OXENHAM, M.A. London : Allen & Co.

OUR readers are well aware that we profoundly distrust Dr. Döllinger, and consider his recent course opposed both to true theological principle and to the interests of religion. There is no occasion, however, here to express our reasons for this opinion, as the work before us occupies ground almost entirely external to the points at issue. We do not deny, indeed, that we open any volume of his with an antecedent prejudice ; on the contrary, we maintain that such is the legitimate attitude of a good Catholic's mind : but we have honestly endeavoured to estimate this work fairly on its own merits.

Its idea seems to us admirable, and (so far as we know) quite original. The author considers that such a continuous history of the Christian Church as he contemplates in future volumes, if it is to be really satisfactory, should be preceded by a careful treatment of our Lord's ministry and of the Apostolic period ; and that such treatment should be mainly grounded on a most careful and exhaustive study of the New Testament. Such, then, is Dr. Dollinger's excellent plan. The execution of that plan seems to us varying in merit. In many portions it is as admirable as the plan itself ; in other portions defective ; in a few, even deserving of reprehension. And our readers will the better understand the reason of this variety, if they consider the author's peculiar characteristics.

Of those studies which are appropriate to a Catholic theologian as such—putting aside those merely philosophical—some are pursued with fully equal (perhaps, alas ! with greater) zeal by Protestants ; while there are others of which the Protestant world hardly knows the existence. Of this latter kind is the scientific mastery of Dogma as a whole ; again, Moral Theology ; and again, Ascetical and Mystical : of the former kind is inquiry into the nature and extent of inspiration ; critical exegesis of Scripture ; critical examination, both of ecclesiastical history in general, and of doctrinal development in particular. Now we do not object at all to the mere fact of Dr. Döllinger having given far more profound attention to the latter than to the former class of studies ; for we believe that a largely increased division of theological labour is among the exigencies of the time. But we do think (1) that every Catholic theologian of eminence should possess more acquaintance with the former class than the present author displays ; and (2) that Dr. Döllinger most unfortunately and narrow-mindedly under-estimates those studies which are not to his own taste. The language, indeed, on scholasticism, which he held in his celebrated speech at Munich, is absolutely identical with what the Church has since condemned ;\* and we think that these volumes present abundant evidence of a similar spirit.

For instance. Considering the enormous preponderance assumed by dogma

---

\* See Syllabus, prop. xiii.

in the ecclesiastical history of every age, we cannot think that he has here laid down anything like an adequate doctrinal foundation for his future volumes; on the contrary, we hold that specially dogmatic investigations should occupy at least ten times the space which he has assigned to them. No enterprise can well be imagined, either more important at this time in itself, or more serviceable for a real study of ecclesiastical history, than to examine in detail the full evidence furnished by the New Testament—(1) on the body of dogma received by the Apostles from our Lord; (2) on the doctrines taught by them to the various classes of their converts; and (3) on the particular shape in which they expressed those doctrines on this or that occasion. This is what Dr. Döllinger's undertaking required; but what in our judgment he has by no means accomplished. We are far from undervaluing the singular power and skill which he has displayed throughout in bringing together from various parts of Scripture, and combining into one whole, a vast number of scattered doctrinal references. He has fulfilled his own conception, speaking generally, with remarkable completeness and success; but the conception itself (as we have said) seems to us essentially defective.

We could easily illustrate our criticism from various doctrines; but our limits confine us to one instance. We will take, then, purposely one particular point, on which we (*i.e.* the present writer) warmly concur with Dr. Döllinger's doctrinal view. There is hardly any more critical question, in examining S. Paul's view of Justification, than the drift of his constant contrast between "works" and "good works." It is admitted by all Catholics that the latter term means with him "works founded on faith;" and that he always considers "works" as differing in this respect from "good works." But it is a most important question, whether by the term "works" S. Paul generally means to express "actions morally good, not founded on faith, and of the purely natural order;" or whether he attaches to the term some sense altogether different. Dr. Döllinger (as we understand him) adopts the latter alternative. We must consider, indeed, some among his incidental statements of doctrine as mistaken:\* still we think that on the whole he has thoroughly seized the true drift of S. Paul's teaching; and we cannot but warmly admire the power with which he has brought together, within so short a compass, so large and well-connected a group of Pauline dicta. But why *did* he confine his treatment of the matter within so short a compass? A full systematic exhibition of S. Paul's teaching on Justification could not, we verily believe, be presented in less than half a volume of the size before us; and we will here mention only one of the defects which arise, from the brief treatment adopted by our author.

The Church has pronounced various most important judgments against Baius and Jansenius. It would not of course be appropriate to have con-

---

\* Thus, "*The form which righteousness takes in man, Paul calls faith.*" Man's "*righteousness is nothing else than faith*" (vol. i. p. 273). "*Hope, love, fear, trust, humility, steadfastness, and zeal—all are comprised in justifying faith*" (p. 274). The language also about original sin, in p. 254, strikes us as incorrect.



sidered in the present work those judgments as such ; but it was imperatively called for that S. Paul's doctrine, in disparagement of "works," should be drawn out with so much fulness and accuracy, as to show its complete distinctness from all those errors which the Church afterwards condemned. But to do this adequately, would require a larger and deeper scientific mastery of dogma, than any which (so far as we know) Dr. Döllinger has ever displayed.

Indeed, we may go further. We fully believe indeed (as we have said) that the author does *not* understand S. Paul to use the word "works" as expressing "morally good works of the natural order." We are led to this opinion, not only by various express statements, but by the whole drift of his doctrinal exposition. Yet he has not by any means expressed this elementary proposition with the clearness which was desirable ; and still less has he given any distinct explanation of what S. Paul does mean by the term. In p. 295 this obscurity is especially notable. He says, firstly, that S. Paul expresses by the term "works where the mere outward act, and not the principle or motive, is the thing considered ;" and such works of course are for the most part not morally good at all. He then says that these "works" "are done indeed from obedience to a command, but from a selfish, blind, slavish obedience ;" from which explanation no one, we think, will derive any precise impression whatever. Finally, he adds, that they are "works which the unenlightened man, left to himself, does from his own natural powers ;" and this phrase rather points to the interpretation which he started by excluding ; viz., that they are morally good acts of the natural order. And if the reader will carefully examine his language in pp. 258, 261, 264, 272, 279, 280, 284, he will find several instances of similar indistinctness and apparent vacillation.

We have been obliged by our limits to take an instance from one particular portion of one particular doctrine ; but remarks more or less similar might be made on every part of Apostolic Dogma which he has treated at all.

And this very phrase reminds us of one doctrinal subject which he has absolutely omitted. Surely, considering the immense development of Marian devotion which has grown up in the Church, it was incumbent on Dr. Döllinger—in order that in his subsequent volumes he might appreciate that devotion—to examine carefully the question, what the New Testament declares concerning the Mother of God ; to express an opinion as to the degree of veneration in which she was held by the Apostles ; and on the place which she occupied in the Church, whether before or after her Son's ascension. In vol. i., p. 173, he explains Apoc. xii. 1-6 without any reference to our Lady, and (so far) in direct contradiction to Catholic sentiment ; but all positive mention of the Most Holy Virgin he seems, as if on purpose, to have carefully avoided.

In vol. i., p. 228, the author amazes us by saying that "the first deposit of doctrine"—by which we understand him to mean the doctrine delivered by the Apostles during their life—"consisted mainly of facts, principles, dogmatic germs and indications." Why, we need not go beyond these volumes for an overwhelming refutation of so strange a thought. Read that very

compressed and pregnant analysis of S. Paul's doctrine on Justification, to which we have been so recently referring; is that assemblage of beautiful doctrine a mere *germ*? a mere number of *facts*? or of *principles*? or of *indications*? And whether one reads the author's account of our Lord's teaching (vol. i., p. 23 to p. 47) or the whole second chapter of his second book, one is struck with ever-increasing astonishment that the theologian, who wrote these expositions, should have expressed himself in the strange way on which we are commenting.

His translator is even more obviously self-contradictory. In Dr. Döllinger the above expression seems to have been (as it were) casual and incidental; but Mr. Oxenham quoted and laid earnest stress on it, in an express treatise on development. Yet in his preface (p. ix) to the present work he gives an opinion, we think a most just one, that S. Paul's "statements" on justification are "fuller" even than those of the Tridentine Council.

We regret to add that Dr. Döllinger's inadequate dogmatic study has led him to one far more serious inadvertence. In vol. i., p. 54, speaking of our Lord's agony, he says, "*a passing wish came over Him that, if it were possible, this chalice of agony might pass from Him . . . But the next instant the clear returning consciousness of the irrevocable counsel of God triumphed in Him.*" And this unhappy mistake leads us to lay greater stress than we should otherwise have done, on inaccuracies, much less serious but in the same direction, which occur in pp. 7, 10, and 16.

We have said so much on the question of dogma, that we can but most briefly express a similar remark on that of ascetics. There is a most definite theory of the interior life pervading all Catholic ascetical works, and contrasting emphatically with Protestant "spirituality." It would be a most important and interesting task to exhibit the profound harmony of this theory with the Apostolic teaching, and with our Lord's sacred Words. Now we are very far from wishing to undervalue the admirable remarks made by Dr. Döllinger in vol. ii., pp. 181-195, and elsewhere; but no one will say that he has seriously applied himself to such an enterprise as that above sketched. Yet it was an enterprise, we think, entirely called for as a foundation for his subsequent history. And it is a consequence of this unfortunate brevity on dogma and on ascetics, that subjects, which might have been made transcendently interesting, assume in these volumes a somewhat dry and repulsive appearance.

We wish we could have left ourselves room to dwell on the more simply favourable side of our comment. As things are, however, we must be brief in expressing our most hearty and unqualified admiration of many portions. The second and third chapters of the first book, and almost the whole second volume, are most excellent and instructive. We would particularly refer to Dr. Döllinger's treatment of the episcopal question (vol. ii., pp. 104-141); of the *χαρισματα* (pp. 152-159); and of Christ's teaching on marriage (pp. 222-233). Our present impression is indeed, that this latter is the first thoroughly satisfactory explanation which has been given of a most serious difficulty.

We must protest, however, against the theory of inspiration implied in

the first line of p. 216 in vol. i.; and perhaps elsewhere. But we cannot enter here on this theme.

With all drawbacks, these volumes constitute a very valuable addition to English Catholic literature; and even had Mr. Oxenham done his work roughly and inelegantly, he would have conferred a signal service. But we are bound to add that (so far as one unacquainted with German can judge) this translation is admirably executed; and the additional notes are generally unpretending and useful.

We wish the more, then, that Mr. Oxenham had not obliged us to criticize him unfavourably, by his extraordinary remarks in p. xi. of his preface. There are various Catholics—we are ourselves in the number—who consider that Dr. Döllinger is theologically unsound for two reasons, to mention no others: (1) and chiefly, because he does not accept as infallible any decisions of the Church, except definitions of faith; and (2) because he does not accept as infallible that particular decision (Syllabus, prop. xiii.) which concerns scholasticism. We have often enough given our reasons for thus thinking, and Mr. Oxenham was most free to reply to those reasons. Instead of making such an attempt, he oracularly pronounces that “such a method of serving” the Church’s “cause” as our own appears to such men as Dr. Döllinger “the most fatal, because the least intentional, contribution to the progress of unbelief.” It will be a very welcome novelty, when all this vague declamation is succeeded by at least some little attempt at argument. As yet it would appear that all the argument is to be left in exclusive possession of the “bigots;” and that “liberals” will condescend to no other line of opposition, than that of unreasoning invective.

Mr. Oxenham further, without giving one single reason for his judgment, denounces our course as “un-Catholic,” “un-German” and “un-English.” He does not, however, seem so clear whether it is also un-French, un-Spanish, un-Belgian, or un-Italian.

---

*In Sancti Gregorii Nysseni et Origenis scripta et doctrinam nova recensio, cum Appendice de Actis Synodi V. œcumenicæ, per ALOYSIUM VINCENZI, in Romano archigymnasio Litterarum Hebræicarum Professorem: voll. 4. Morini, Romæ. 1864.*

IT was about the year 307 that S. Pamphilus, soon to become a martyr, wrote, in his prison at Cæsarea of Palestine, the *Apologia pro Origene*. In this work the holy Confessor, who had spent a long life of sacred literary labour on the scene of the schools of Origen, was assisted by his fellow-prisoner Eusebius, the future Father of Church History, and the six books were dedicated to the confessors who were then suffering for Christ in the copper-mines of Arabia, at the southern extremity of the Dead Sea. Origen had been dead for fifty years, and the controversies that seemed to have been silenced by his death had risen again more clamorously than ever. Of the six books of S. Pamphilus, but one has reached our times; of those that he

tells us were being written by others his contemporaries, not even one; but, since the day that he and Eusebius worked at the justification of their master until our own times, the Origen controversy has seldom slumbered long; and perhaps the majority of students of Church History have come to the conclusion that nothing certain can ever be decided.

Professor Vincenzi, happily for the interests of patristic literature, has thought differently. His work, which has been before the public now more than a year and a half, is a complete re-opening of the whole question, and, we may add, a re-settlement of it in a sense that will rejoice the hearts of many a lover of Origen who has had an instinctive repugnance to admit him to have been a heretic. We shall best make our readers acquainted with the book, and at the same time indicate the ground travelled over by the author, by giving a short account of each of the four volumes into which it is divided.

The first part, or volume, undertakes to prove the "complete agreement of S. Gregory Nyssen and of Origen with Catholic dogma on the question of the eternity of future punishment." \* It is well known that S. Gregory of Nyssa, Origen, and some other early writers, speak of a certain *παλιγγενεσία* (*regeneration*) or *ἀποκατάστασις* (*restoration*) that is to affect all human nature, whereby its *viciousness* (*κακία*) will be destroyed, and itself will be made incorruptible, and even receive *blessedness* (*μακαρία*). The bulk of this volume is taken up with an explanation of this theory and these terms. The adversaries of Origen's orthodoxy have maintained that the "restoration" here meant was nothing less than the final salvation of all men, or what is now called Universalism. It appears, however, that neither the Alexandrian doctor nor his disciple meant anything of the kind. In the first place, they both, in a multitude of passages, state as clearly as words can state, their adherence to the dogma of the eternity of punishment. In the next place, the "restoration" of human nature is proved, by a comparison of texts, a critical examination of translations, and citations from contemporary authors, to mean that "restoration" which will happen to all mankind, good and bad, at the resurrection of the dead, whereby their bodies, freed from the mortality caused by original sin, will be rendered immortal and capable of sustaining endless joy or endless torment. All the difficulty about it has arisen from a very simple cause. Origen and S. Gregory had a definite object in insisting upon it. Celsus, for instance, scoffed at the notion that a "filthy carnal body" could be the subject of an eternal existence; and other impugnors of the resurrection used similar arguments. Hence we find the theory in Tertullian, and traces of it even in S. Jerome. But when the resurrection of the body ceased to be a controverted point, there also ceased to be a necessity for stating the fact of the "regeneration," and so the statements in Origen and other fathers became fossilized and apparently unreasonable. One argument employed by Professor Vincenzi to show the reasonableness of what Origen says, is worthy of notice. It is a correction of a well-known text in that celebrated fifteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians, in which S. Paul says so

\* *Sancti Gregorii Nysseni et Origenis de aeternitate poenarum in vita futura omnimoda cum dogmate Catholico concordia.*

much about the resurrection. The Vulgate reads, as in the English version : "Behold, I tell you a mystery ; we shall all indeed rise, but shall not all be changed." Professor Vincenzi ventures to say that this reading is a mistake ; and he does so on no less an authority than that of the famous Vatican Codex. This most ancient Greek MS. reads thus :—"Behold, I tell you a mystery ; we shall all \* *not sleep*, and we shall *all be changed* ;" that is, both good and bad ; an emendation which not only expresses the very "restoration" spoken of by S. Gregory and Origen, but is much more in accord with the whole run of the Apostle's context.

The second volume is entitled "Origen vindicated from Impiety and Heresy in his other doctrines."† As the treatise, *Περί Ἀρχῶν*, or *Concerning Principles*, is that on which nearly all the accusations of heterodoxy rest, the author begins by a luminous exposition of the motives and object of this much-impugned treatise, proving that it was not an attempt to make Christianity square with the Platonic philosophy, but an essay towards a scientific statement of Christian dogma, including a recognition of what truth and beauty there was in the philosophy of Greece, and a refutation of the perverse use both of philosophy and revelation made by such heretics as the Gnostics and Marcionites. We cannot enter into a detailed examination of this Part, which extends to upwards of 500 pages ; we can only state that the objections to Origen's orthodoxy, here fairly stated, and for the most part successfully met, include the whole range of the points usually controverted ; on Metempsychosis, the Angels, the Nature of God, the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, the Consubstantiality of the Word, the Holy Spirit, the Human Soul, the Eternity of Matter, the Plurality of Worlds, &c. Perhaps the most interesting chapters of this Part are those in which the author considers the question of the genuineness of the two rival versions of the *Περί Ἀρχῶν*, by S. Jerome and Ruffinus, and decides, after much acute criticism, that "the MS. which Ruffinus translated contained the real opinions of the author,"‡ notwithstanding some conjectural emendations which Ruffinus says he made ; and that other MS., used by S. Jerome, "were full of heretical corruptions."§

The third volume contains "The Critical History of the question at issue between Theophilus" (the Alexandrian Patriarch), "S. Epiphanius, and S. Jerome, against Origen, and S. John Chrysostom, Theotimus, Ruffinus, and the Nitrian Monks, in his favour."|| The hero of this third volume may be said to be Theophilus of Alexandria. This turbulent and intemperate

\* Πάντες οὐ κοιμηθήσόμεθα, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγθήσόμεθα (p. 186).

† *Origines ab Impietatis et Hæreseos notâ in ceteris institutionibus vindicatus.*

‡ Jure arbitror istos, quos Ruffinus transtulit codices, sinceros continere auctoris sensus (p. 24).

§ Ceteri, quoscumque vis, a Hieronymo lecti, undequaque videantur corrupti ab hæreticis (*ib.*).

|| *Historia Critica Questionis inter Theophilum, Epiphanium et Hieronymum, Origenis adversarios, et inter Joannem Chrysostomum, Theotimum, Ruffinum et Monachos Nitrienses, Origenis patronos.*

prelate \* is well known for his persecution of S. John Chrysostome. He is also distinguished as the prime mover of that whirlwind of opposition and opprobrium which everything connected with Origen underwent about the year 400. What made him so bitter against Origen is not quite clear, but his surname of Ἀμφαλλάξ, or the *Turn-coat*, seems to point to expediency as the motive of his denunciations. He had a solemn synod assembled, and the books of Origen read before the Bishops, by whom, he tells us, they were unanimously condemned. The point of interest here is to know what is meant by these "books of Origen." To have read all the works of Origen, or a hundredth part of them, would have tried the endurance of any synod of mere mortals. We must therefore conclude that what was read was a judicious selection. Our author devotes a chapter to the elucidation of this point, and decides that there must have been a Syntagma, or summary of Origenist doctrine, ready prepared for the decision of the Synod, which Syntagma was afterwards sent to S. Jerome and S. Epiphanius, whereby the former of those Fathers was converted to that intense zeal against Origen with which his name is so intimately connected. And so, by the "execrable perfidy"† of Theophilus, S. Jerome was deceived, and multitudes since his time have unquestionably followed him in his deception.

The important question, whether Pope Anastasius condemned Origen or not, is also felicitously discussed in this Part. The Pope condemned, certainly not Origen, as he *expressly* says, but, to all appearance, the identical Syntagma compiled by the unscrupulous Theophilus.

The fourth Volume is "The Triumph of Pope Vigilius, of Origen the Adamantine, and of the Emperor Justinian in the 5th General Council."‡ If there is an intricate question in Church history, such a question is certainly that of the Three Chapters, the 5th General Council, and Pope Vigilius.

Professor Vincenzi clears the Emperor Justinian from heresy, and, what is more important, Pope Vigilius from the very undignified vacillation of which he is very commonly accused.§ He first of all carefully quotes and analyzes the various documents bearing upon the Pope and the Council, especially the *Judicatum* and the *Constitutum* (names often confounded, and which, in fact, both mean a judicial decree of some kind). The Pope had a difficult part to play. He had to please the Greeks, who wanted the Three Chapters condemned, and not to offend the Latins, who were ready to see, in that condemnation, a slight upon the Council of Chalcedon, which had left the Chapters untouched. Thence his caution in the first *Judicatum*. All sorts of misunderstandings, however, followed it, and the Pope, now at Constantinople, consented to the assembling of a general Council. He afterwards refused to attend this Council, saying he would send in his sentiments in writing. This is the first point whereon he "vacillates." But Professor Vincenzi shows he had a perfect right to stop away, and several excellent reasons for doing so ; as, for instance, that the vast majority of the assembled

\* Receveur, *Hist. de l'Eglise*, ii. 482.

† P. 319.

‡ *Vigilii Pontificis Romani, Origenis Adamantii, Justiniani Imperatoris Triumphus in Synodo Œcumenica V.*

§ See Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon*, p. 61.



prelates happened to be Greeks. The Council met and discussed. That its canons were afterwards approved by the Pope we know, both from the sixth General Council and from other sources. His own sentiments he gives, as he promised, in a second *Constitutum* or *Judicatum*, in which he reiterates and develops the condemnation which he had pronounced in the former. Certain words in this second decree are quoted to show that, during the seven years which had elapsed between it and its predecessor, the Pope had wavered, and was now retracting. This Professor Vincenzi proves to be a false inference. Finally, he proves that a certain additional decree or *Constitutum*, expressing retraction in still stronger terms, is undoubtedly a forgery. This last document, brought to light by Petrus de Marca in the seventeenth century, has been suspected by others before our author; though Hefele, in his account of the fifth General Council, seems to accept its genuineness.\* Several chapters are devoted by Professor Vincenzi to critical remarks on this and several other documents. The explanation of all this troublesome and chaotic history is not far to seek, and, moreover, explains the reason of the connection of Origen's name with the extant fragments of the Acts of the Council. The object of the Pope and the Emperor in calling the Council was to have the Three Chapters condemned and done with. On the other hand, there arose a party who upheld the Three Chapters. It was to the interest of this party (and to that they devoted their energies) to represent that the Council had been called, not to condemn the Chapters, but to condemn certain heretics who had been condemned long ago; and that the Council had not said anything about the Chapters, but had only anathematized these heretics, into the list of whom they slipped the name of Origen, a name which had the double advantage of being a good party-cry and of being hitherto uncondemned. With these ends, they produced quite a little literature of false epistles, forged decretals, and unhistorical Acts (p. 208). Thus Origen's name got into bad company, and has suffered in reputation ever since; as, indeed, has Vigilius himself. It is true that more than one writer has guessed or argued that Origen cannot have been mentioned in the fifth General Council. Hefele, in his valuable "History of the Councils," has ably summed up the arguments, and decided in the same sense as Professor Vincenzi; but our author has the merit of making a complete and consistent story, from independent points of view, of the whole case, and it is satisfactory to find that what clears Pope Vigilius, clears also Origen.

We should be glad if this brief notice of an important and independent work induced students of Church history in England to read it for themselves. The *Civiltà Cattolica* called attention to it last October, and, in a criticism on Part I. confessed that the author had completely exculpated Origen from the charge of denying the eternity of punishment. In the number also that appeared on May 5th of the present year, the work was again noticed in terms of high praise. We may add that Professor Vincenzi's book bears the *imprimatur* of the Master of the Apostolic Palace and of the Roman Vicegerent.

---

\* Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, ii. 881.

*Ecce Homo.* A Survey of the Life and Work of Jesus Christ. London : Macmillan.

THIS work has created a most unusual interest in the Protestant religious world ; so much so, that Catholics are somewhat eager to know what they should think of it. For our own part we substantially agree with the powerful and thoughtful article which appeared in the June number of *The Month* ; and we are not without hope that in a future number we may express at greater length the reasons of our opinion. Many statements contained in the volume will be doubtless most shocking to all our readers ; nor can we wonder if many Catholics—particularly those less acquainted with the present direction of Protestant religious thought—regard the “*Ecce Homo*” with almost unmitigated aversion. But for our own part, considering the truly deplorable and most calamitous tendencies of English Protestantism at this moment, we cannot doubt that the book will exercise a powerful influence in the less anti-Catholic direction. The writer’s tone throughout is most loyal, and (one may even say) reverential, to Him whose life he treats ; and the whole spirit of his work is profoundly earnest and serious. We observe, moreover, that *Fraser’s Magazine* assails it with great bitterness ; and we have great belief in the unerring instinct with which that magazine detects and abhors every argument or line of thought tending to what is good and holy.

---

*The Church and the World: Essays on Questions of the Day* by various Writers. London : Longmans.

THIS volume has been sent us for notice ; and we have had much pleasure in finding, from a general inspection of its contents, that the *Union Review* is far from faithfully representing the universal tone and temper of Unionists. The *Church Review*, of which we have lately seen many numbers, is another instance in point ; and we see plainly that there are many extreme Anglicans, who are deluded indeed by the dream of corporate union, but who write and (no doubt) think in a truly Christian and temperate spirit.

As to the volume before us, we do not profess to have looked at it very carefully, as this happens to have been an unusually heavy quarter. The subjects treated are of very varying importance ; the most momentous of all being that which the Rev. M. McColl has chosen : “*Science and Prayer.*” We are of course in most hearty agreement with the author in his conclusions ; and he writes most unaffectedly and straightforwardly : but he seems to us more successful in stating candidly the infidel objection, than in elaborating a solid and satisfactory reply. Yet he will have done a really inappreciable service, if he lead the way to a more profound examination than his own of the theological and philosophical difficulties which his theme suggests.

We have read carefully through the ninth paper, which is autobiographical, without being able to guess ever so distantly, on what possible theory of ecclesiastical authority the candid and excellently intentioned authoress bases her refusal of submission to Rome.

*The Holy Communion: its Philosophy, Theology, and Practice.* By Rev. F. DALGAIRNS. Second Edition. Dublin and London: Duffy.

THIS work was reviewed by the DUBLIN at its first appearance; but we are unwilling that its second edition should be published without a commemoration of the fact.

It impresses our imagination with F. Dalgairns's unusual variety of study. We are really not aware of any author who equals him in this respect: so profound in Metaphysics; so profound in Ecclesiastical History; so profound in Ascetic Theology. It is among the most unfortunate facts of our time—considering his truly orthodox principles and most unreserved submission to the Holy See—that his prolonged illness has for so considerable a period prevented the Church in England from benefiting by his literary services.

Perhaps the most important feature of this volume is the author's argument (Part iii., c. 2) against those very exaggerated notions which have prevailed concerning the rigorism of the early Church; and his unrivalled picture of *Jansenism* in the same chapter and in the note at p. 430. His metaphysical power is strikingly exhibited in the second chapter of the first part, which has been greatly improved in this edition: and of his ascetical acumen, perhaps the chapter on worldliness (Part iii. c. 5) will give as good a specimen as any. It ends with these most serious words:—

"There are cases where . . . the soul is perfectly engrossed with and absorbed in the world, and where God is practically forgotten. In such cases I freely admit I do not see on what principle Holy Communion can be [ever] allowed, except as it is sometimes given to sinners of most doubtful repentance, out of sheer compassion, for fear of their being driven altogether from God" (p. 378).

If any unfavourable criticism is to be made on the book, such criticism must be founded on the very circumstance which illustrates its author's variety of study. The volume is, perhaps, somewhat too heterogeneous.

Translations of it have appeared in Italian, French, and German; so that its good effects have been widely extended over the Catholic world.

---

*A Catholic Eirenicon.* London: Hayes.

WE did not notice this pamphlet in April; because it was impossible to do so satisfactorily, without pursuing various inquiries, for which we had no leisure, into the history of English Catholicism since the Reformation. We hope before long to publish an article on this subject as a whole; and into that article we shall incorporate whatever is to be said on the particular document which forms the chief contents of this pamphlet. But our readers will thank us for at once republishing a letter on the subject from the Rev. Mr. Anderson, which appeared in the *Weekly Register* for March 31st. The italics are our own.

(To the Editor of the *Weekly Register*.)

"SIR,—The *Saturday Review* of the 24th inst., in an article headed 'The Oaths Bill and the Ultramontanes,' speaks thus:—

"It is perhaps well for Roman Catholics that Ultramontaniam had no existence in England when the last of the Roman Catholic disabilities were

VOL. VII.—NO. XIII. [*New Series.*]

removed by the Relief Act. Archbishop Manning and his allies would have made this settlement impossible. It will be worth while to contrast the language held by the old-fashioned and hereditary Romanists in this country with the pretensions now put forward by the Ultramontanes, and by those *Romanis Romaniores*, the recent converts. *There existed a profession of faith on doctrinal and political principles which, from about the year 1680 to the present century, all Anglo-Romanists appealed to, and on the faith of which emancipation was slowly won from the fears and prejudices of England.* This is the famous declaration of "Roman Catholic principles in reference to God and the King." It has lately been reprinted, not, we suppose, without melancholy reference to the change which has come over the Ultramontane section of the English Catholics. We find that from 1680 to 1815 as many as twenty-four editions of this document have been traced. It was adopted by such famous champions of orthodoxy as Hornyhold, Berington, Walmesley, Poynter, and Waterworth; and it has been said not unjustly of it, and, as it seems by a Roman Catholic, that "by a loyal profession of these principles our fathers effected a reconciliation between themselves and their our country in State."

"Further, the *John Bull* of the 24th inst., in its 'Literary Review' (supplement) calls the same work, as now reprinted from the edition of 1815, 'an exposition of Roman Catholic doctrine in a compendious and popular form, the authorship of which is attributed to Rev. James Croker, a Benedictine, in 1680, and has since been a text-book with Roman Catholics in this and other countries. It contains also a defence of the social and political principles of Roman Catholics.'

"Public attention having thus been called to a book which might not otherwise fall in the way of your readers, it seems time to lay before them its true character, and the degree of authority it can claim. I trust you may be able kindly to afford space for the following extracts, as showing the position assumed towards this publication by *Bishop Milner, and the Vicars Apostolic of England in his day.* Your readers will judge how far the descriptions above given of this book are accurate; *how far it speaks the language of hereditary Catholics,* or was appealed to by all 'Anglo-Romanists,' or has since been a text-book with Roman Catholics in this and other countries.

"Provost Husebeth's 'Life of Bishop Milner,' p. 226.

"The chief objection to it [Kirk and Berington's "Faith of Catholics"] was, that it adopted as its text an exposition of doctrine known by the name "Roman Catholic Principles in references to God and the King," first published in the reign of Charles II. . . . He (Dr. Milner) . . . examined some of its propositions. One declares that "the merits of Christ are not applied to us otherwise than by a right faith." This, as it stands, sanctions the condemned errors, that man is justified by faith alone, and that infant baptism is of no avail. . . . Dr. Milner censured another proposition which declared it "no article of faith that the Church cannot err in matters of fact or discipline;" and the suppression of the Pope's title of Vicar of Jesus Christ,' &c., &c.

"*Ibid.*, p. 262. Dr. Milner writes (against the objection that this treatise had never been censured), that if its first appearance 'was, as alleged, at the end of the reign of Charles II., it was no wonder if it was not censured, since there was then no Bishop, Archbishop, or ecclesiastical Superior in the kingdom.' As regards its republication by the agents of the *Protestant Dissenting Committee*, in 1791, 'Dr. Milner, having been the agent of the Vicars Apostolic at that time, affirms that it was condemned by them, and even stigmatised by their supporters as the *Staffordshire Creed.*'

"*Ibid.*, p. 347. 'The Bishop first censures Mr. C. Butler for patronising and publishing, as one of the creeds of the Catholic Church, that treatise best known as "Roman Catholic Principles in reference to God and the King."

.... 'It is a fact,' he says, 'known to the writer of this, that the Vicars Apostolic, then living, *highly disapproved* of the measure (its unauthorised publication nearly thirty years before) and of the treatise itself.'

"*Ibid.* pp., 410, 411. Dr. Milner's letter in 1819, to a General Vicar of his district, 'was written in consequence of Mr. Charles Butler having, in three several works, proclaimed the treatise known as "Roman Catholic Principles," to be "a just and fair exposition of the Roman Catholic creed, in direct opposition to the authoritative censure of that formulary by Dr. Milner."' . . . The Bishop gives 'the objection to it on the part of the Vicars Apostolic and the Scotch Bishop Hay; he instances one proposition from it which the *English Vicars Apostolic* in 1792, *condemned even as heretical*. He refutes Mr. Butler's assertion that Bishop Hornyhold gave a partial edition of the "Principles;" the fact being that Bishop H. merely denied three or four vulgar charges against Catholics, in terms partly resembling the corresponding articles in that formulary.' . . . Dr. Milner says at the conclusion of this letter: 'I declare, under correction of the Catholic Church and the Holy See, that the said treatise is *inaccurate and censurable in many respects*.'

"*Ibid.* pp. 468-70. Bishop Milner's 'Lenten Pastoral' for 1823, speaking of the same formulary, 'charges his clergy not to admit this into their flocks as a *just and accurate exposition of Catholic doctrine*, and reminds them of his having previously specified his grounds for censuring it as *defective, ambiguous, suspicious, and erroneous*.' . . . He informs his clergy, 'that to his judgment and censure all the Catholics of the district have submitted, except one lay gentleman of the law.'

"Dr. Milner's 'Letter to a General Vicar of his District,' of which some account is given in the fourth extract here sent to you, may be found *in extenso* at the end of his 'Supplementary Memoirs of English Catholics,' appendix A. It is a valuable document, well worthy of reproduction, but too long to be here inserted, and hardly to be abridged.

"Believe me, Sir,

"Your faithful servant,

"W. H. ANDERDON."

"8, York-place, Monday in Holy Week."

---

Correspondence between Rev. R. E. Guy, O.S.B., and Rev. Canon McNeill,  
D.D. Liverpool: Rockcliff.

DR. McNEILE, the well-known Protestant controversialist, cuts a very sorry figure in this correspondence. He begins by stating, as a matter of fact, that no Catholic is permitted to read the vernacular Bible, without a certificate of fitness; and that "such certificates are not easily gotten." Being brought to book, he admits that he knows nothing whatever of present Catholic practice, whether in England or elsewhere; and yet he will not admit that he spoke incorrectly. Firstly, then, he cites an alleged Tridentine decree; and, when it is demonstrated that no such decree was ever made by the Council, he again alters his statement, while again refusing to admit that he has been wrong. And more than once he makes the ludicrous assumption—just in order to say something—that the Church compromises her infallibility by varying her discipline.

F. Guy is as superior to him in argument as in straightforwardness; and his replies *ad hominem* are absolutely crushing. Yet we cannot enter into everything which F. Guy says. Thus, at starting, he complains (p. 5) of Dr.

McNeile's "odious accusation." We cannot see how it is an odious accusation—though no doubt it is an unfounded statement—to allege that the Church still continues a discipline, which she undoubtedly once enforced; and which every Catholic is bound—as F. Guy himself actually does—to defend *in principle*. Then, again, we really cannot see any difference worth mentioning, between a Tridentine decree sanctioned by the Pope on one hand, and a Papal decree on the other; for in either case the decree derives its whole authority from the Vicar of Christ. Nor can we concur with the late Bishop Doyle and with F. Guy in thinking (p. 19) that, "of all things said against" Catholics, "there is not anything said more opposed to truth than that" they "are averse to the circulation of the [written] Word of God" in the vernacular. "Lectio Sacræ Scripturæ est pro omnibus" is a condemned proposition; Quesnel's 80th. And considering that the Church has, in various times and places, taken active steps to limit the circulation of vernacular Bibles, it does seem to us that there are many frightful accusations, brought against Catholics, which are very far more violently "opposed to truth" than is the particular accusation in question. Cardinal Wiseman, as quoted by Dr. McNeile in p. 16, impresses us as having stated the true Catholic doctrine very fairly and temperately.

The question of vernacular-Bible-reading is far too extensive and important to be discussed in a notice. We are not without hope that, before very long, we may have an opportunity of treating it at length.

---

*Homeward. A Tale of Redemption.* By the REV. H. A. RAWES, M.A. W. Knowles, 7, Norfolk Road, Bayswater.

**F.** RAWES is singularly happy in the choice of titles for his books. "Homeward," like "Sursum," tells its own story. It is the pilgrimage of the Christian soul from the shadow of the great darkness, whence she has been rescued by Redeeming love, through the desert of life and the cold waters of death, to her home in the palace of the King.

It is a true poem, partly in prose, partly in verse; the prose being, to our thinking, far more poetical and vigorous than the poetry, which scarcely equals some of the author's former productions; for instance, those exquisite lines in "Sursum," "The three Songs of the Bride." As a whole, however, "Homeward," we think, far excels that or any of F. Rawes' former works.

The "Tale of Redemption" is told with a simplicity suited to the ear of a child by a cottage fireside, and yet with a pathos and a majesty befitting the sacredness of its sublime subject, and which harmonize without break or jar with the language of sacred Scripture used by F. Rawes with the fulness and freedom of one whose heart and mind have been fashioned and moulded in that divine treasure-house. "Homeward," to be appreciated, should be read as a whole; and therefore, even had we space to do so, we should refrain from making extracts.

It abounds in strong contrasts of light and shade, the effect of which would be lost unless seen in succession. Witness the dreary, desolate sublimity of the Prologue, with the doomed ship drifting onward to destruc-



tion, and the glorious autumn-sunset, lighting up the great Harvest-home, which closes the Epilogue. Or, again, the lonely conflict of the Divine champion breasting the red torrent with His ransomed Bride in His arms, and the calm, majestic repose in which, seated motionless on His white war-steed, with His many diadems upon His brow, He watches the last triumph of His faithful army over the legions of hell assembled to contest her passage through the river which divides her from her Home.

The description of the desperate and final conflict between the hosts of good and evil is, perhaps, the most powerfully-written passage in the book. The squadrons of death are at last swept away by the white waves of the army of light "as the white glittering breakers in the storm sweep masses of dark tangle and drift-wood resistlessly along the beach." From "that field of doom, where there were no mourners to weep over the slain," we turn to the Bride stepping down into the dark river, with a loving smile on her face, as she sinks beneath the waters "that she may go to her love, that she may find Him in her home."

"The dark waters closed over that sweet, beautiful smile.

A circling ripple spread itself out on the surface of the deep, swiftly-flowing river.

Her long, dark veil floated away down the stream."

We see her next "white-robed and golden-girdled" in the garden of the king.

There are exquisite touches in the picture of that heavenly garden described as the *desert* transfigured and made new. We find all the wild flowers which peopled our childhood's favourite haunts on heath or glen, in tangled coppice-wood or forest-glade, blooming in their familiar loveliness amidst the mystical lilies and pomegranates. "Drooping willows grew by the water-courses, but they did not seem sorrowful there; and the aspens were bright in the light, but they did not tremble there.

"There the golden crowns of the water-lilies always shine in the brightness of the day, for there they never hide themselves beneath the water. Never do they close their alabaster cups there, for no shades of evening ever fall upon that land."

Yet it is harder for the pen of man to write of that blessed Home than of the long journey homeward. After all that can be said, we fall back upon the "*Eye hath not seen nor the ear heard*," which speaks greater things to our hearts than human language can convey. And those who have meditated most deeply upon the blessedness of heaven feel most deeply the inadequacy of their own words to describe it.

"I have wanted," says F. Rawes, "to set the blessedness of this Home before you, that you might love it greatly and desire it greatly; that its shadow might be a shelter to you in this desert, keeping off from you the burning heat; that the thought of all its indescribable joy might be to you a solace in your cares, and trials, and sorrows; still more, might be a solace and a comfort in those times of fearful anguish; those times, days, or years, perhaps, of unutterable agony; which come to some (should I say to many?) from the hands of our Father, always merciful, always compassionate, always full of love. You must bear with me if I have done it imperfectly, for it is

very difficult in the weak words of earth even to shadow forth the blessedness of our Eternal Home. And, if anyone thinks I have done it very imperfectly, I think so still more. This book, therefore, is not what it might have been; that I know. Yet, such as it is, I hope that it may help some on their way through the desert to their Home."

*Royal and Other Historical Letters, illustrative of the Reign of Henry III.*

From the originals in the Public Record Office. Selected and edited by the Rev. WALTER WADDINGTON SHIRLEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. Published by the authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, under the direction of the Master of the Rolls. Vol. II. 1236-1272. London: Longmans. 1866.

DR. SHIRLEY published his first volume of Letters in 1862, and, as we understand him, this, the second volume, is to be his last. We have never been able to ascertain the principle on which he selected the letters he published, and are therefore unable to say whether he has been successful in his undertaking. However, the second volume is disfigured by fewer blemishes than was the first, and the Canon has added a table of errata, modest in size, but which an unfriendly critic could seriously enlarge.

The prefaces to these volumes are written in an unfortunate manner: for it is very difficult to conceive how any man could, even after reading the letters of this series, penetrate so deeply into the secrets of Popes and Kings, as we are persuaded Dr. Shirley has done. "We find," says the Professor, "to our surprise, the worthless Faukes de Breauté becoming, for a moment, the pivot upon which the politics of Europe are turning" (p. xxiv.). Is this true? Was that soldier so important a personage as to occupy the serious attention, say of the Emperor of Germany? Again, was he so "worthless"? If he was so, he must have been a very considerable hypocrite, for there were persons, among his contemporaries, who did not think so ill of him.

"At a later date we have the Archbishop of Bordeaux endeavouring, by Papal letters, secretly obtained, to embarrass the English government in Gascony" (Pref., p. xxiv.). Dr. Shirley refers his readers to p. 101, and there we learn from the King's agent in Rome that Prince Edward, son of Henry III., and the heir to the throne, had confiscated to his own use all the temporalities of the Church of Bordeaux when that see was vacant. The archbishop denied the justice of what was done, and it is in his favour that the agent of Henry III. does not venture to say that such proceedings as those of the prince could be justified. As Dr. Shirley's sympathies are not with the plundered prelate, it would be interesting to know what he would say if the Prince of Wales had, during the recent vacancy, taken his canonry into his own possession, and deprived the ecclesiastical Professor of the revenues which were due to him. If, under those circumstances—improbable certainly—Dr. Shirley had applied to the courts of law for redress, nobody would have accused him of "embarrassing the English government."

The Professor says that this letter, to which he refers us, was written

between the first and the tenth day of November, 1254. If that be so, it is another fact which goes a great way to show that the Professor's sympathies are misplaced: because the King refused redress for so many years; and if that refusal can be proved, the letters could hardly have been secretly obtained. Now there was no vacancy in the see of Bordeaux from the end of January, 1227, before January, 1259.

The compilation of an index is no doubt beneath the dignity of a Professor of Ecclesiastical History; but an editor, nevertheless, is bound to look after it. We read in the Index, "Anney, bishop of." Persons not Professors of Ecclesiastical History may be forgiven if they are startled by such an announcement. Dr. Shirley has translated "Episcopus Aniciensis," Bishop of Anney, instead of bishop of Le Puy.

In p. xxv. of the Preface, Dr. Shirley calls our attention to the "report of the audacious chaplain who keeps two wives and claims a Papal dispensation." For this we turned back to the first volume, and after some trouble, for Dr. Shirley has spared himself the trouble of a reference—we find a letter in which the Rev. William Dens, vicar of Mundham, near Chichester, is delated to the bishop of that see as a bigamist. Mr. Dens produced letters from the Pope, apparently justifying his proceedings; but the Sussex people, among whom he lived, said that those letters were never issued by the Pope, and that they were contrary to the decrees of a general council. The bishop's correspondent, who delates the iniquities of the Rev. William Dens, is not very much scandalized by them; and it may be said that he treats them as a very common affair; for after asking the bishop what he was to do in the matter, he reminds his prelate of the necessity, above all things, (*super omnia*,) of having six wolf-dogs in the park at Aldingbourne.

The story is very strange: a bigamist clerk, the people talking of general councils, and the bishop's agent saying that six hounds are more necessary than the discipline of the Church. Here are the words:—*Duas habet uxores, ut dicitur, quarum . . . una apud Cicestriam. Qui quidem Willemus literas detulit a summo Pontifice, ut dixit, sed in partibus Sussexie . . . sit, quod nunquam literæ illæ a conscientia domini Papæ emanaverunt, sed contra statuta concilii generalis, fuerant impetratæ.* (Vol. i., p. 277.)

The people of Sussex were very sceptical about the alleged dispensation: they regarded it as a fraud on the Pope, and contrary to the decrees of a general council. Now, what general council ever forbade a priest to have two wives at once? Did the Sussex people know of it? Can Dr. Shirley, Professor of Ecclesiastical History, produce the decrees which it made? We should like to see them ourselves, and we do not know where to look for them.

The truth of the matter seems to be this:—The Rev. William Dens was in the early part of the thirteenth century, like a great many of his brethren, a respectable and prosperous pluralist. He had two wives, as they say, *ut dicitur*; that is, he held two benefices. Those who were not his friends would not believe in the dispensation, and quoted the decrees of a general council; those of Lateran in 1179, under Alexander III., and again repeated in another council of Lateran in 1215; both, then recent, and not yet quite forgotten. The Professor who edits these letters is probably a grave and sober man, who

does not know a jest when he sees it, and, moreover, who is not quite familiar with the modes of speech current among ecclesiastics who spoke Saxon and Norman French. S. Francis of Sales might be convicted on better evidence of being not only married, but actually acknowledging his wife—*femme*; and as his conviction would be unjust, so we believe of Mr. Dens. That respectable ecclesiastic had more than one benefice, perhaps with cure of souls; but we do not think it can be said of him that he ever had even one wife, otherwise than in the sense of being a pluralist.

---

*Cosas de España ; illustrative of Spain and the Spaniards as they are.* By Mrs. WM. PITT BYRNE, author of "Flemish Interiors," &c., &c. London and New York : Alexander Strahan. 1866.

"COSAS DE ESPAÑA" is a most readable book on Spain. It is not written for a purpose, or on a foregone conclusion. Almost every page bears evidence of the freshness and impulsiveness of the writer. A practised traveller, a keen observer of things, yielding to an excited curiosity concerning the habits of a newly visited people, and to a thirst for accurate knowledge, noting facts as they arose on every side, and drawing rapid inferences, was sure to find, in such a peculiar country as Spain, stuff for an interesting and lively book. Such a traveller is Mrs. Pitt Byrne, the authoress of "*Cosas de España*," and of several other popular books of travel. Eschewing the commonplace, the authoress threw herself on her own resources in her journeyings through Spain, in her dealings with the Spaniards, and in her researches for information. The travelling party, for the writer, it appears, was accompanied by some near relatives, seems to have enjoyed themselves heartily. Nothing came amiss, or any misadventure but added to the zest of the travellers. Such an enjoyable spirit, rising at times into fun, secures the readers of the "*Cosas de España*" from ill-tempered observations and cross-grained criticisms, which are temptations but too likely to beset unwary or ungenial travellers in such an out-of-the-way country as Spain.

The design of "*Cosas de España*" is to present its readers with the moral and material aspects of Spain as it is in its period of transition. Such periods are always noteworthy, not only because they present a state of things about to pass away from familiar observation, but because they are the seed-plots of future good or evil. If the observer accurately discerns the nature of the seeds which are being cast in the soil, and faithfully describes what he sees, he enables every man to form an estimate of the harvest which the next generation is to reap. To present a picture of things as they are, and to forecast the future lot of this almost unexplored country, is the purpose of this latest work on Spain. To this end the authoress, during her sojourn in the Peninsula, has collected a large store of facts, necessarily miscellaneous in their nature, but all illustrating in their degree, and by their very variety, the character of the people. Although statistics, interesting and useful, are by no means wanting, "*Cosas de España*" is not a merely statistical book. It is not only back-bone. The skeleton outline furnished by official or well-collected statistics, is filled up by the results obtained from personal observa-

tions of a varied character. Olive yards, and city factories, rough country roads, and fashionable promenades, prisons and theatres, give colour and life to the picture. This enterprising party of travellers left the high road or the rail, and went, so to speak, across country. The rough road, the field, the ditch, the village inn, gave ample materials of observation. The country bumpkin, the peasant woman, the motley crowd at the inn door, the grave and solemn stare giving way to the natural courtesy of the Spaniard, are all pourtrayed by pen and pencil in such a way as to show that the experience of Spanish life was well bought at the expense of the personal comfort of the spirited travellers.

But Mrs. Byrne's observations were not all drawn from one source; although she "roughed" it in the country, she indulged in the luxurious sights of cities; although she was charmed with the wooden wine-press of the sleeping vine-dresser's cot, yet she also had to endure the sanguinary spectacle of the Madrid bull-fight. Picture galleries and ruined palaces gave their silent testimony to the past greatness and fallen grandeur of Spain. Concerts and theatres exhibited modern tastes and customs, and bookshops and publishers' lists showed the extent or character of modern Spanish literature. The authoress points out, let us remark by the way, as one of the great impediments to the success of new works, the deficiency of really clever reviews and magazines in Spain.

Had we space even to attempt an analysis of this instructive and lively work, our readers would be surprised at the variety of the information to be found in these two well-furnished volumes. The happy lot of the vine-dressers of Valladolid or of the Andalusian olive-growers, finds its contrast in the prison scenes of great cities which are described with life-like exactness by Mrs. Byrne, who has made herself familiar with the prisons and the prison discipline of most countries in Europe. On this special subject she has a right to speak. We quote, as follows, one fact she mentions about the attendance at the chapel attached to the prison near Valladolid, as showing a want of zeal and absence of discipline which are not to the credit of the authorities, ecclesiastical or civil:—"The chapel is a very plain and most unattractive place; though large, it can only contain a fourth of the prisoners, so that, as there is only one mass a week, the bulk of them, who are obliged to remain in the draughty corridor outside, never hear mass at all. This corridor is their préau, or recreation room, and during the office they amuse themselves by playing at various games. Notwithstanding the very indifferent way in which moral discipline is practically carried out, there is a show of theoretical morality, and pious aphorisms are painted up on tablets all round for the edification of the prisoners." (P. 120, Vol. I.) For the description of Spanish prisons and prison discipline, which seems satisfactory, we must refer to the work itself.

We will not attempt to describe the grandeur and the variety of Spanish cathedrals, churches, and monasteries, which our traveller met with, and has so graphically pictured, from her first entrance into the Basque provinces until she took up her quarters at Córdova. What contrasts are not presented to us in these pages—relics of fallen greatness jostled out of place by the energy of modern enterprise, the apathy of contented indifference, or the pride of

Castilian blood, aroused or wounded by the presence of the foreign capitalist ! Then we are told of the overthrow of ancient customs, prejudices, and self-complacent dreams of national superiority by the advent, so eloquently described by Mrs. Byrne, of all-conquering iron. Railroads—those great levellers—are beginning to break up the Spain of romance and of indolence. Of their prospects, and of the effects which they are producing on the national character, we must refer again to "*Cosas de España*" itself. No reader can go over those pages without gaining a lively impression, not only of the ancient cities and of the wayside or mountain scenery of this beautiful country, but also of the customs and peculiar characteristics of this, in many respects, singular people. Such an impression is considerably enhanced by the spirited woodcuts, which add so much to the pleasure and value of these handsome volumes. With quick and thoughtful observation the peculiar characteristics of Spanish sights and scenery, national costumes and buildings, have been caught and reproduced with happy effect. The steep, hilly descent to Santa Cruz, with the mountains in the distance ; one diligence, with its numerous mules, rushing down the decline, and another clattering on the foreground, accompanied by drivers with cracking whips, are executed with great dash and bold and accurate perspective. Segovia and its Gothic cathedral will be sure to attract the reader's admiration. Córdoba, also, with its Moresque tower and buttressed bridge over the Guadalquivir, is a spirited sketch. It was very thoughtful to provide for the stay-at-home readers of these volumes such pleasant glimpses of actual life in Spain. These illustrations, which are of great variety, bear the monogram, "R. H. B.," and are, we believe, the work of Mrs. Pitt Byrne's sister and fellow-traveller in Spain.

In parting with this agreeable and instructive book, we have one objection, or rather, perhaps, explanation to make. The impression, then, which "*Cosas de España*" conveys as a whole is that Spain is not only out at elbows, and unenterprising in industrial pursuits, but that she has also yet to be civilized ; that she is not up to the progress of the age. Now, if this means that Spain, owing to no matter what causes, has lagged behind these marvellously enterprising times ; that she has yet to learn from France or England almost the first elements of commercial prosperity ; that, from indolence of character or from national prejudice, the natural resources of wealth are undeveloped, and her credit consequently low in the markets of Europe, we grant the estimate to the full. But if the estimate implies anything more than this—if it means that in the higher branches of civilization, in moral culture, in the knowledge and practice of the divine precepts, in national virtue and consequent happiness, Spain is behind England and France,—we hold such an opinion to be open to grave objection. In as far as civilization—not meaning thereby merely the progress of the material arts—in Christendom is not Christian, it is not progressive but retrogressive ; it is a going back to the materialism of Pagan ideas, and the effect of such a return to Pagan principles of civilization would necessarily be a dissolution of Christian society. But not to make too much of this objection, or rather to show that in reality the writer of "*Cosas de España*," while justly criticizing the want of industry and enterprise in Spain, gives full credit to the high



moral worth of the Spanish character, we cite, to conclude our notice of this varied work, one out of many passages recording the high and noble qualities—the virtues of self-denial, forbearance, generosity, which are the long results of Christian civilization on the Spanish mind :—

“The national code of honour,” says the authoress of “*Cosas de España*,” “has been thus detailed by one of their popular writers : ‘Ese código hace que el que es ingrato se le llame mal nacido. If a man be ungrateful, the people say of him he is as one whose father is unknown. If he be perjured, they mark him as infamous as with an iron brand. If he deceive a woman, they point at him the finger of scorn and cry, “villain.” If he abandon his parents in old age, they spit in his face.’ Among the country people the habits of life are simple, and their morals very pure. The virtues of the village women have formed the theme of eulogium among social writers. ‘The village women of the single-minded Catholic Spaniards have exceptional hearts ; they are mines of love—pure and holy models of wives and mothers.’ It is the wife who is always the depository of the family funds, from whatever source. The Andalusians are benevolent, hospitable, and charitable. Alms they call ‘la bolsa de Dios’—the purse of God. They also entertain a respect and veneration for age, which is often a charming characteristic of a simple, unsophisticated people. They address any old person (though reduced to pauperism, and become a ‘*pardiosera*,’ as beggars expressively term themselves) as ‘tio’ or ‘tia,’ answering to our ‘gaffer’ and ‘gammer,’ corrupted from grandfather and grandmother ; and if he approach their dwellings at the hour of a meal, they ask him to sit at table with them and ‘*echar la benedición*’—say grace for them. . . . The Andalusians were formerly remarkable for their piety, the traditions of which still live among them. Up to the end of the last century theatres were forbidden in Sevilla, and the number of little images and altars placed in niches, at the corners of streets and on the walls of houses, was so great that the town required no other lighting than the votive lamps that burnt before them. Very few of these survive to the present day ; but of the prospects of religion in the Peninsula, a modern Spanish author writes thus :—‘The tide has, however, now turned : at the present day there are numbers of men, and especially young men, who constitute among themselves what may be called an aristocracy of religion and virtue, giving promise that the day is not far distant when the cynicism of vice will fall under the contempt and ridicule which is already the lot of the old cynicism of infidelity.’ Of the practical virtues of honesty, sobriety, and cleanliness, we found very obvious evidences in Sevilla itself ; and in the course of walks, rides, and excursions into the rural neighbourhood, we observed them in a still greater degree. The cleanliness in some of the poorer suburban houses, and in the clusters of very humble cottages forming little villages of a very primitive character, is quite Dutch in its perfection, and gave us a favourable idea of the bright, happy Andalusian race, among whom we had come. Our readers will perceive that we have as yet only established ourselves in Sevilla, where we hope to sojourn for some time. Sevilla, with its present treasures of antiquity, and the past associations with which they are connected, deserves almost a volume to itself. It becomes an episode and a chapter in the life of him who visits it.” The authoress of “*Cosas de*

*España*" proposes to treat, in a future volume, an entirely different phase of the Spanish character, as exhibited in the active populations of the southern and eastern provinces. We shall look forward with interest for the appearance of the promised volume on a country so interesting and yet so little known as Spain.

---

*Lectures on Catholic Faith and Practice*, by REV. J. N. SWEENEY, O.S.B.  
London : Richardson.

BY an unfortunate accident these volumes did not come to hand, till it was too late in the quarter to give them that careful notice which they deserve ; and we think it better, therefore, rather to delay our notice, than to fail in giving due attention to so important a work. Nothing can be more admirable than F. Sweeney's plan ; and wherever we have happened to dip, we have found most orthodox principles enforced with great vigour and freshness of argument and illustration. We have been led by the circumstances of the moment to look carefully at the author's reply to Protestant objections against Marian worship (vol. iii., pp. 147-184) ; and we earnestly recommend it to our readers, as one of the most successful arguments on the matter which we have ever seen. In October we will give a full view of the entire work.

---

*Journal of Eugénie de Guérin*. Edited by G. S. Trebutien. Simpkin, Marshall, and Co. London : 1865.

WE have read this journal with deep interest, and yet with a feeling of something like remorse, as if we were looking at a letter not intended for our eyes, or listening to a confidential conversation : in so great a degree does its charm depend on its unconsciousness, and upon the perfect conviction of the writer, that to no eye but his for whom she writes would this record of her deepest and most hidden feelings ever be disclosed.

"When everybody is busy (she says), and I am not wanted, I go into retreat, and come here at all hours to write, read, and pray. I note down here, too, what goes on, either in my mind or in the house ; and in this way we shall be able to find again, day by day, the whole past. For me, what passes is of little worth, and I should not write it down, but that I say, 'Maurice will be very glad to see what we were doing while he was away, and to re-enter thus into the family life ;' and so I wrote it for thee."

The journal of Eugénie de Guérin embraces, with occasional interruptions, a period of six years, from 1834 to 1840. It is simply the record of a woman's daily life in a remote château in Languedoc, written for a brother far away in the midst of the great intoxicating world of Paris, partly, it would seem, to give utterance to the affections of a heart which flowed forth in love upon all God's creatures, and rested with almost idolatrous fondness upon him ; partly to give him pleasure ; and, most of all, as a means of speaking a word to him for God, by keeping the thought of home alive in his heart ; for Maurice de Guérin, whose childhood had been so holy and so

pure that venerable prelates of the Church had looked forward to the day when he should be called to minister at her altars, had fallen under the fatal influence of the unhappy Lamennais, and followed that wandering star into the darkness of scepticism. The brightness of his genius, and the grace and beauty of his person, which might have beseeemed a troubadour of the chivalrous days of his own sunny Languedoc, made him the idol of the infidel and intellectual society of Paris. Yet the companion of Victor Hugo and Madame Sand was still bound to the holy traditions of his childhood by the old links of home memories, kept bright and strong by the loving and untiring hand of his sister; and by the might of her patience and her prayers she drew the wanderer home at last to die a Christian death—"a death," as she says, "upon a crucifix."

We have no space for the quotations, which we would fain make, from a book so full of beautiful and holy thoughts. Eugénie de Guérin, like her brother, was a poet; the light of poetry falls upon the commonest and humblest features of her every-day life, and homely beyond the wont of women of her degree, was the life of this gifted child of an ancient but impoverished house, who leaves her pen ever and anon, now to wash her gown in the stream, now to assist in preparing the family meal. Her intense love of home and kindred, and her keen enjoyment of country life, are such as ordinarily belong rather to a German or an English woman than to a Frenchwoman. Hence, perhaps, the popularity which her journal has obtained amongst English Protestants, who, finding there so much of the natural goodness and beauty in which they can fully sympathize, have been willing to tolerate in her that measure of the supernatural which must needs be expected in a Catholic.

Some, we hear, have placed her on a level with S. Teresa; while others have contrasted her favourably with the saintly Curé of Ars. All this Protestant sympathy, together with one or two questionable passages in the journal, such as an expression of enthusiastic admiration for that unhappy child Lady Jane Grey, may possibly raise a suspicion that the spirit of Eugénie de Guérin's journal is not purely Catholic: we should say rather, that it is not *distinctively* Catholic, certainly not *saintly*. We have the picture of a pure and beautiful spirit, in which baptismal grace had been shielded from exterior temptations, and from any severe internal trial, save that to which in a measure it yielded—the temptation to suffer an innocent and most unselfish earthly affection to darken her heart with its shadow, and to intercept the shining of the full light of God's countenance upon it. S. Teresa, whose love for her brother so strongly attracted Eugénie's heart, could never have said, "I want Maurice and God." We are not presuming to censure or to criticise; it would be a hard heart that could do either: we would simply warn Catholic readers not to expect what they will not find; and assure Protestants, who compare Eugénie de Guérin with Jean Baptiste Vianney, that they speak of what they do not understand. He who makes even the imperfections of His faithful children work out their eternal good, used what was excessive in the sister's love to win back the brother's soul, and to purify her own, as in a fiery crucible, for Himself.

There are some few trifling blunders in the English translation, which

betray an uncatholic hand ; such as the repeated mention of *parsonages* at Languedoc : but it has the merit of simplicity and spirit ; the verses especially flow with the ease and grace of original poetry.

---

*Mass of the Holy Child Jesus, for Unison Singing, with Organ Accompaniment, composed for the Church of the Oratory, and dedicated to the Very Rev. Father Dalgairns, by WILHELM SCHULTHES, op. 40. London : Lambert & Co.*

WE have much pleasure in directing attention to the above work of Herr Schulthes. Our supply of Mass music of a simple and popular character is by no means too abundant, and we are ready to welcome the present addition to our stores, especially as it comes recommended by its connection with the Oratory of St. Philip Neri at Brompton. We understand that the present Mass, which was composed by the desire of the late Rev. F. Gloag, is already in use by the pupils of the Training School at Hammer-smith and elsewhere, and that it is found both easy and effective. We should think it, therefore, well worthy the attention of communities and schools especially where, as in convents, music for treble voices is required. We may venture to add that in small choirs it would not be amiss if simple devotional masses like the one before us were oftener substituted for those difficult compositions which are frequently attempted without the means for their proper execution.

---

*Melodies for the Hymns of F. Faber, F. Caswall, S. Alphonsus, &c. 18mo. Accompaniments for the same, royal 8vo. London : Lambert & Co.*

THERE are now, it is presumed, few among us who do not sympathise with the movement in favour of popular hymn-singing set on foot by the Oratorian Fathers some ten years ago, and of which experience has so unmistakably shown the advantage, especially to the middle and lower classes of our Catholic population. For the setting on foot of the movement the chief materials, as is well known, were the Hymns of the late lamented F. Faber. These were followed, or rather accompanied, by the beautiful translations and other compositions of F. Caswall ; and more recently our store has been still further enriched by the simple and charming verses of S. Alphonsus, so well translated by the Fathers of his Order. All these, with other publications having a similar object, may now be heard in our schools and popular services throughout the length and breadth of the land, and are destined, we doubt not, to be the delight and edification of young and old for years to come. The highest praise we can give to the little work before us is to say that it is a worthy companion to the poetry to which it is allied. Hymns without music have their use, and an important one, as Father Faber has shown in the Preface to his Hymns ; but the addition of melody, and again of harmony, immensely enhances their value for all public, social, or educational purposes. In these aspects we can hardly imagine a more useful Manual than the present ; and as a book for the present day it seems to us to supply the difficult, though

not impossible combination,—of simplicity and attractiveness with musical taste and skill. This, indeed, might have been expected from the names of the eminent Catholic composers we meet with in glancing over its pages. Herr Schulthes, of the Oratory, is, as is meet, a frequent contributor, and his melodies for some beautiful hymns of F. Faber never before set to music will be much esteemed.

---

*Substance of the Speech made by Earl Grey in the House of Lords, on the 18th March, 1866, on the State of Ireland.* London: Murray.

*Contributions to an Inquiry into the State of Ireland, by the Right Hon. Lord DUFFERIN, K.P.* London: John Murray.

**L**ORD GREY'S speech on the state of Ireland is characterised by the great natural acuteness and clear sincerity which belong to his mind and character; and no English statesman has denounced the folly of governing Ireland on the assumption that the Roman Catholic religion is false, and must therefore be systematically discouraged, in more indignant or in wiser language. His grand remedy is a redivision of the ecclesiastical property of Ireland among the Catholic, Protestant, and Presbyterian communions, in proportion to their respective numbers. We do not dispute the justice and policy of such a proceeding; but we utterly disbelieve that it would have the particular effect which Lord Grey contemplates. It would not touch the great discontent which prevails in Ireland. That discontent is almost altogether caused by the bad relations which as a rule prevail between the Irish tenantry and their landlords. Until the contest between these two classes is settled by legislation, or comes to some other end, there can be no peace in the country. During the recent Fenian proceedings the Roman Catholic clergy did their utmost to maintain the Government and to prevent the spread of the conspiracy—and probably with more effect than if they had been in the receipt of a Regium Donum at the time. To offer the Catholic clergy a state provision may be just and politic; but there is hardly a priest in Ireland who would not declare that if the object of statesmen is the pacification and prosperity of the country, that can only be secured by limiting the powers of the landlord, and securing the fruits of his industry to the tenant.

We confess to a grievous sense of disappointment in regarding the contents of Lord Dufferin's volume. Lord Dufferin is one of those rare persons among the Irish oligarchy—we must unfortunately prefer the word to aristocracy—who might serve his class by endeavouring to harmonize their interests with that of the country, and whose character has a fascination, sure, if it were only well enough known, to attract a wide-spread popular loyalty in Ireland. Ireland is greatly capable of being served by and of serving such a man. The easy and brilliant genius, the graceful wit, the fine dexterity of style of the Sheridans, come to him with his mother's blood: it may be feared too, somewhat of the crude and shallow character which belonged to the politics of the greatest of the name. There is a passage in one of Mr. Sheridan's speeches, in 1809, on Catholic Emancipation, of whose peculiar falsetto character certain sentences in Lord Dufferin's speech of last March remind us. "What is the use of emancipating the Catholics?"

asked Mr. Sheridan. "It is like giving a laced hat to a man who wants shoes to his feet." "There is no use," exclaims Lord Dufferin, "in legislating for Ireland, in consequence of Fenianism. The present Fenian movement in Ireland is entirely disconnected from any of those questions which can ever become the subject of parliamentary interference." But why is Fenianism formidable, and why does it endure? Because of the wide-spread discontent which the neglect and the inertness of Parliament in regard to those questions generates. Because the Irish people in general despair of any redress of any wrong, however gross, by process of Parliament, unless they can first produce a panic on the part of Parliament. It is a fallacy, therefore, to urge that the Fenians are not really solicitous for Tenant Right, and do not press for the disendowment of the Established Church, or for Freedom of Education. What the Fenians substantially say to the Irish people is: "It is no use to ask Parliament for these concessions. Parliament will never do justice to you, unless under pressure of force. But let us abolish Government by Parliament, and then all the rest will follow." If Parliament, however, would only do its duty in regard to those great grievances, of which every dispassionate person admits that the Irish people have cause to complain, this the one great argument for disaffection would cease to have any more force with the Irish than it would have with the English or the Scotch people. If the English or Scotch people were treated as the Irish have been and are; if the law compelled them to endure a Catholic Church Establishment, and the whole population was reduced to the Irish system of tenancy at will, administered by Irish landlords, Parliament might have to reckon nearer home with something worse than Irish Fenianism.

This fundamental fallacy seems to us to vitiate all Lord Dufferin's argument, for it involves the conclusion that the case of Ireland is one to which legislation can do no good, or next to none; and Parliament is only too willing to be allowed to abstain from legislating. We deeply deplore the fact that such a man as Lord Dufferin, instead of applying his excellent intellectual powers and great influence with his Party to the solution of the problems of government which press for settlement in his country, should commit himself to what would amount to an advocacy of the cold-blooded and stupid system of managing Ireland, which prevailed during Lord Palmerston's administration; but from which his successors seemed to have broken away. It is bare justice to say that the Tenant Right Bill introduced by Mr. Fortescue this session is the largest and fairest measure of the kind introduced by any Government; and, if it should fall through, as is but too probable now, the fall of Lord Russell's ministry will be a grave calamity to the people of Ireland.

---

WE have received too late for notice in this number a copy of Mr. Earle's excellent Manual of the History of the Popes, just published by Messrs. Richardson, which seems to us to answer very admirably to a want which many have felt in English Catholic literature; and we are obliged reluctantly to postpone, among others, a notice of Dr. McCorry's pamphlet on the Scotch Sabbath.